

The Review of English Studies

VOL. I.—No. 4.

OCTOBER 1925.

MILTON AND THE KING'S PRAYER

BY JOHN S. SMART

THERE is an old accusation against Milton, often revived and half believed, which has been put forward without qualification by Mr. Liljegren in his recent *Studies in Milton*. Fresh investigation of the affair is required, and the production of new evidence, by which it may be finally settled.

When the *Eikon Basilike* was published in 1649, some editions of it contained four prayers said to have been used by Charles I. Milton discovered that one of them had been borrowed from Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*, and vehemently accused the King of plagiarism. The accusation is that Milton himself, with the connivance of Bradshaw, had caused the book to be reprinted, and inserted the prayer in order to prepare the way for his attack, which was contrived by treachery, fraud and malice.

This story first appeared in Wagstaff's *Vindication of King Charles the Martyr*, and was there attributed to a printer called Henry Hills; who affirmed that he had heard Milton and Bradshaw boasting of their stratagem, and laughing over the cheat which they had put upon the world.

In accepting and repeating the charge, Mr. Liljegren relies upon the authority of Henry Hills; and it is therefore desirable to ascertain who Hills was, what degree of credit can be given to his word, and what opportunity he possessed of listening to the private talk of Milton and Bradshaw. During a great part of the time when the question of the prayer excited public interest, Henry Hills was in jail.

Just after the Civil War Hills established himself as a printer in London. He joined with the extreme Puritans, and was a member of the Anabaptist Congregation—

Groaned, sighed and prayed, while godliness was gain.

But he was arrested for adultery and incarcerated in the Fleet Prison, the prosecutor being Thomas Hams, a tailor. In his cell Hills wrote an extraordinary pamphlet, *The Prodigal Returned to his Father's House*. It is full of unctuous hypocrisy. Attached to it is a letter which he had sent to Thomas Hams, imploring forgiveness in abject terms for his own "incomparable, detestable wickedness," and beseeching Hams to consent to his release for the sake of his poor wife and family. He subscribes himself "Unworthy to be your slave," and dates the letter, 12 Dec. 1650. It is so obviously insincere that it merely inflamed the anger of the recipient, and Hills remained in prison.

A study of the pamphlet shows that Hills was then no more than an obscure adventurer; and he himself laments that he was in complete poverty, and that all his friends had forsaken him. That a man who was thus, on his own showing, entirely destitute of position or influence was admitted to the secrets of those in power, and was present at their most intimate conversations—before or after his imprisonment—is hard to believe.

There is not a fragment of evidence, apart from his own assertion, to suggest that Hills ever spoke to Milton in his life. But his adventurous career was not without successes. He was "a forward and confiding man." After his release from the Fleet he obtained employment as printer to the Commonwealth, and at the Restoration he continued in his post, and became printer to the King.

In 1679 began a new chapter in his history. The success of Titus Oates brought out other perjured witnesses against the Catholics. Thomas Dangerfield rivalled Oates himself by his unscrupulous falsehoods, and set them forth in a book, *Mr. Thomas Dangerfield's Particular Narrative of the late Popish Design*. The names of several publishers appear on the title-page, the first being that of Henry Hills, who was now zealously engaged in the anti-Popish crusade.

On the accession of James II. retribution arrived. Dangerfield was prosecuted for perjury, and whipped through the streets. As

his publishers shared the responsibility for his fictions, they were exposed to the civil law. The Earl of Peterborough, who had been accused of instigating Dangerfield to murder Shaftesbury, brought an action for libel against them, and recovered heavy damages. Hills was also in danger of losing his position as King's Printer, but saved himself by a prompt conversion to the religion of the new sovereign. During the reign of James he issued from his press a flood of Catholic tracts and sermons.

In 1688 appeared a broadside entitled *A View of part of the many Traitorous, Disloyal and Turn-about Actions of H.H., Senior*, apparently written by an honest Catholic, who distrusted the new convert. After recalling Lord Peterborough's successful action against Hills for slander, the writer adds :

We do not hear our Zealous Convert has either acknowledged his Crime to that Honourable Person, or shown any sign of Submission ; Nay, he had the confidence to say, *He never wronged his Lordship ;* or the Right Honourable Lady who also hath a verdict against him for *Scandalum Magnatum*.

As the Countess of Powis had been slandered with peculiar effrontery in Dangerfield's book, it is evident that she was the lady referred to, and that she also had proceeded against Hills for his share in the libel.

At the Revolution Hills fled to St. Omer, and in 1691 he was dead (State Papers, Dom., 1690-91, p. 485). His pretended revelations were communicated to the world after his decease by two respectable physicians, who had once had him as their patient. According to their report, Hills made the statement that "he had heard Bradshaw and Milton laugh at their inserting a paper out of Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia* at the end of King Charles's book." The evidence of Hills may be regarded with as much distrust as Falstaff's tailor felt for Bardolph's security. He had in his own day a well-earned reputation for lack of principle ; was convicted of slander in a court of justice ; and was associated with Dangerfield, who was the professional rival of Titus Oates. His story of an incriminating conversation conducted in his presence by unblushing conspirators, reckless how they may betray themselves, is in the vein of the witnesses to the Popish Plot.

One of the credulous physicians recorded a conversation in which Hills gave fuller details of the imposture. The printer Dugard,

from whose press came the *Eikon Basilike*, was arrested by the Council, and was set free at Milton's request—on condition that he inserted the spurious prayer in his next edition. Mr. Liljegren offers an alternative theory of how the trick was done. He calls attention to an entry in the Stationers' Register, March 16, 1649. On that day the publisher, Matthew Simmons, obtained the copyright of *Eikon Basilike*, and was licensed to print it. As Simmons had relations with the ruling powers, it is assumed that he acted with their consent, and that a dark mystery lurked behind this entry. He was authorised by the Government to print the very book which they wished to suppress; and they must have expected to gain some sinister advantage. Here Mr. Liljegren discovers proof that "the revolutionaries *did* print the *Eikon* anew, as stated by Hills." Dangerfield's accomplice is the leading witness for the prosecution, and his evidence is thus propped up.

But if Simmons were acting in collusion with the revolutionaries, who had interdicted the sale of *Eikon Basilike*, his entry may rather have resembled the "blocking licences" by which Shakespeare's company sought to save some of his plays from falling into the hands of pirates, and keep them back from the press. They caused an entry to be made in the Stationers' Register by a friendly bookseller, who returned the manuscript, and published nothing. In the same fashion Simmons may have claimed the copyright of *Eikon Basilike*, and abstained from printing it, his proceeding being no more than a move in the game of suppression. No edition by Simmons is known to exist; and at a later date he cancelled the entry in the Stationers' Register, which he would have preserved in self-defence, had he ever published the book.

The prayer from the *Arcadia* forms no part of the actual text of the *Eikon Basilike*. It is found amongst the *Prayers used by His Majesty in the time of His Sufferings*, which are included in some editions, as an appendix apart from the main work. In the volume before me the *Prayers* form a separate pamphlet with its own pagination. Whatever may have been the origin of the *Eikon Basilike* itself—a question into which I do not enter—the pamphlet annexed to it was compiled by some one who had access to the King's papers, and was in the confidence of his friends. It contains, besides the *Prayers*, a letter to King Charles from the Prince of Wales, and an account of his last conversation with his younger children, written by Princess Elizabeth, and signed by her.

The prayers are four in number, the first being that taken from the *Arcadia*. A peculiar interest attaches to the second ; for a copy of it exists in the Public Record Office, and is in the actual handwriting of King Charles (State Papers, Dom., 1631-33, p. xvii.). But it is not an original composition. It is derived, in fact, with some alterations, from a devotional work which was then popular, *The Practice of Piety*, by Bishop Bayly, where it is entitled "A Prayer for the Morning." Bishop Bayly had dedicated the book to Charles, when he was still Prince of Wales.

It is thus established that the King sometimes wrote out with his own hand a prayer which he thought suitable for his private devotions, and that one thus copied by him is included in the publication which contains Sir Philip Sidney's. The natural inference is that Charles had himself selected Sidney's prayer, as well as Bayly's, and used it in the same way and for the same purpose.

It cannot be said too plainly that the conduct of King Charles was perfectly blameless. He intended the prayers for his own use ; he made no claim to their authorship ; he had no intention of publishing them ; and he was not responsible for anything done with them after his death. But this explanation, whilst it entirely acquits the King of the charge brought against him, also exonerates Milton from the accusation of tampering with the book.

The text of the second prayer, as it stands in the pamphlet, is not taken directly from Bishop Bayly's work. It varies from it in many places, and in most of them agrees exactly with the copy in the King's hand among the State Papers. It has a much closer relationship to the King's version than to the Bishop's, although it does not coincide completely with either. The truth seems to be that the King had made two copies of Bayly's prayer, one of which still survives in the Public Record Office, whilst the other came into the hands of those who published the pamphlet of 1649.

The text of the prayer from Sidney also shows important variations, e.g. in the original it opens with the words "O all-seeing Light, and eternal Life of all things" ; which are replaced in the King's version by "O Powerful and Eternal God." At the close several lines have been added. But the changes were obviously made by some one using the prayer in all sincerity and candour. Any one desiring to accuse the King of plagiarism, and publishing it for that purpose, would more naturally have made a literal copy.

Sidney's prayer is attributed in the *Arcadia* to the heroine, Pamela, who is understood to be an ancient Greek. Milton makes much of this circumstance, calling it a prayer taken "from a heathen woman praying to a heathen god," not fit to be used by a Christian, but coming under the same condemnation as meat or drink offered to idols, which St. Paul judged a pollution. This is a far-fetched and ridiculous argument. The *Arcadia* was the work of a Christian author. It is a romance, in which the customs of knighthood are more visible than those of antiquity; and Pamela's religion is Christian rather than Pagan. But the reviser of Sidney's prayer has taken pains to give it a definitely Christian character, concluding it with the words :

So that at the last I may come to Thy eternal Kingdom, through the merits of Thy Son, our alone Saviour, Jesus Christ.

These lines should be placed beside those which the King added with his own hand to Bishop Bayly's prayer, as it stands in the autograph copy in the Public Record Office, and with a slight difference in the pamphlet :

That when I have past this mortal life, I may be partaker of Thy everlasting Kingdom, through the Merits of Jesus Christ, our Lord.

Whilst the similarity is not enough of itself to prove that both prayers were revised by one and the same pen, it points indubitably in that direction.

We thus reach the vital and decisive question, *Who was the reviser?*

If it was the King who adapted the prayer, the charge against Milton falls to the ground. But if the charge is true, it could only have been Milton himself who added the Christian invocation, after transcribing the prayer from the *Arcadia*, and before handing it to the trusty and stealthy Simmons. He was going out of his way, in perfect incoherence of mind, to defeat his own purpose, and blunt his own weapon. The problem raised by Mr. Liljegren can be brought to a clear and certain issue. If Milton was the author of the sentence which contains the words *our alone Saviour, Jesus Christ*, why did he insert it, and thus destroy his own argument that the prayer is a piece of paganism? If he was not, how did the sentence come to be there?

It should be added that Milton, in his reckless haste, misunder-

stood the title-page of the pamphlet, and contradicted something which it had not declared. The prayers were not given out as the actual compositions of the King, "the regal issue of his own proper zeal." They are plainly described as prayers "used by his Majesty." The distinction between a prayer *written* and a prayer *used* is a very real one; for a prayer may be read or recited by persons who have not composed it themselves. Dr. Johnson was justified when he said, "The use of it by adaptation was innocent."

JOHN SEMPLE SMART, 1868-1925

DR. SMART, who died on March 23, 1925, was born in 1868. He graduated as Master of Arts at St. Andrews University in 1894, taking First Class Honours in Mental Philosophy; he also studied in Germany. For some years he was a master at Ayr Academy and afterwards at Glasgow Academy. In 1907 he was appointed Queen Margaret Lecturer in English Literature at Glasgow University.

In 1905 he published his *James Macpherson*, a brief but scholarly introduction to the *Ossian* controversy and an admirable study of Macpherson's poems. The evidence that Macpherson's stories, regarded as rivals to those of authentic tradition, are no more than modern shams is carefully summed up, and the history of their fabrication clearly related. At the same time justice is done to Macpherson's "sensitive and poetic mind."

The University of St. Andrews conferred on him the degree of Doctor of Letters in 1912.

In 1921 he edited *The Sonnets of Milton*. His notes add considerably to the body of information about Milton's friends, and his introduction corrects a number of current misconceptions about the forms of Milton's sonnets and their relation to those of the Italian masters.

Of his shorter studies *Tragedy* (Essays and Studies, English Association, vol. viii.) is the most interesting. His examination of the philosophers who to put the Universe in the right insist on the guilt of the Individual, and his answer to the question, "Is it possible for a wholly innocent person to be the hero of a tragedy?" reveal his powers of enjoying and interpreting the poets. This capacity to understand the heart of his subject combined with his scholarly delight in detail gave distinction to all his work.

A life of Shakespeare was unfinished at his death.

P. A.

ENGLISH ACTORS IN PARIS DURING THE LIFETIME OF SHAKESPEARE

BY FRANCES A. YATES

THE immense popularity of the drama in England during the reign of Queen Elizabeth and after naturally created a large demand for actors, and numerous companies sprang into existence. But it often happens that a sudden demand for persons trained to a certain calling will result soon afterwards in a glut. People hear of large openings and opportunities in a particular direction and rush to take advantage of them; the first-comers do well, but the profession soon becomes overcrowded. So it was among professional actors in Elizabethan England; the supply soon exceeded the demand, and many of the less fortunate or less able practitioners of the art found it difficult to make a living. In these circumstances it was natural enough that some of them should turn their attention to foreign fields of enterprise. The dramatic art was far less developed in most of the countries on the continent than in England at that time, and companies of English actors travelling abroad were received with admiration and generally well remunerated. Among the Alleyn Papers there is a letter, which has often been quoted, from one Richard Jones, an actor, to Edward Alleyn asking for a loan of three pounds. He is about to "go over beyond the seas with Mr. Browne and the company," and requires the money in order to release "a sut of clothes and a cloke" from pawn. He must have the clothes, "for if I go over, and have no clothes, I shall not be esteemed of," and he has no money to pay for them himself; but "by God's help," he continues, "the first mony that I gett I will send it over unto you, for hear I get nothinge: some tymes I have a shillinge a day, and some tymes nothinge, so that I leve in great poverty hear." The case of Richard Jones is probably typical of most of the English players who took to travelling abroad in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

The English companies are known to have travelled fairly extensively in Germany, Austria, the Netherlands, Sweden, and Denmark. The researches of Albert Cohn and others amongst the municipal records of German towns have thrown a good deal of light upon the movements of the English comedians in Germany and Austria. But less attention has been paid to the two visits of English actors to Paris during the lifetime of Shakespeare for which evidence exists. They are referred to in passing by Lintilhac and Rigal; Armand Baschet has a long footnote on the subject in his book on the Italian comedians in France*; Jusserand† devotes several pages to it. Finally, on the English side, Sir Edmund Chambers‡ has summed up all the material hitherto available at the end of his chapter on "International Companies."

This material is extremely scanty. It consists of two short references found among the papers of the Hôtel de Bourgogne and of a few meagre entries in the Journal of Jean Héroard. I propose to deal here, first with the above-mentioned entries in the Hôtel de Bourgogne register and in Héroard's Journal, which together comprise all that has hitherto been known concerning the English actors in Paris at that date; and then to add a few new details which help to throw a little more light on the subject.

In the "Inventaire des titres et papiers de l'Hôtel de Bourgogne," published by Eudore Soulié in his book *Recherches sur Molière et sur sa famille*, § there occurs the following entry:

1598. 25 mai—Bail fait par les maîtres de ladite confrérie a "Jehan Schais, comédien anglois, de la grande salle et théâtre dudit hôtel de Bourgogne, pour le temps, aux réservations, et moyennant les prix, charges, clauses et conditions portées par icelui" passé par devant Huart et Claude Nourél, notaires.

The Confrérie referred to is, of course, the "Confrérie de la Passion," sole owners of the Hôtel de Bourgogne. Jehan Schais|| is evidently a French misspelling of an English name. Sir Edmund Chambers conjectures that we have here "one John Shaa or Shaw, conceivably related to Robert Shaw of the Admiral's men, who witnessed an advance by Henslowe to Dekker on 24 November

* *Les Comédiens italiens à la cour de France*, pp. 101, 102.

† *Shakespeare en France sous l'ancien régime*, pp. 48-53.

‡ *Elizabethan Stage*, E. K. Chambers, ii. 292-294.

§ P. 153.

|| Can "Schais" be a misreading for "Schais"?—ED. R.E.S.

1599." We only know one other fact about Sehais or Shaw and his company—namely, that shortly afterwards they were prosecuted by the *Confrères* for having broken the terms of their contract.

It is quite possible that they may not fully have understood this contract. The organisation of the theatre in Paris at that date must have been a surprise to English actors. London, with its numerous theatres and theatrical companies, had certainly reached a more advanced stage of dramatic development than the French capital at the same epoch. In Paris the "*Confrères de la Passion*" not only owned the only theatre in the town—the *Hôtel de Bourgogne*—but they held a monopoly of acting, ratified by the "*Parlement*," which authorised them to prosecute and fine any persons, not members of the *Confrérie*, who should attempt to give dramatic performances in Paris. They formed, in fact, a very close and jealous Trade Union, determined at all costs to prevent competition.

But in spite of the monopoly and protection which they enjoyed, their position at the end of the sixteenth century was not a prosperous one. As their title, "*Confrères de la Passion*," indicates, they were a survival from the Middle Ages, and they represented an art which was dying out. They clung to the mediæval genres, mysteries, moralities, farces, etc., and these had fallen into disrepute. An outcry had been raised against the ribaldry which had crept more and more into the representation of the mysteries, and in 1548 a decree of the "*Parlement*" forbade the *Confrères* to act any but "*mystères profanes*." They were thus deprived at one blow of the most important part of their programme. Not only was authority ranged against the old genres, but the new literary school which was growing up attacked them on æsthetic grounds. Admirers of Garnier had only scorn for the crudities of farce and morality. Thus it came to pass that the *Confrères* had ceased to flourish, in spite of the protection they enjoyed, because they were an anachronism.

As a result of this failure to retain the public attention the *Confrères* at length decided that it would be more profitable to let their theatre and their monopoly to other companies. Rigal thinks that they did not definitely abandon their theatre to professional actors until near the end of the sixteenth century. In this case, Jehan Sehais and his English comedians were among the first outsiders to hire the *Hôtel de Bourgogne*.

But, as was hinted above, matters did not run smoothly for long between the new players and their employers. The next entry

relating to the English comedians in the "Inventaire" is dated only ten days later. It runs as follows :

1598. 4 juin—Sentence du Châtelet donnée au profit de ladite confrérie à l'encontre desdits comédiens anglois, tant pour raison du susdit bail que pour le droit d'un écu par jour, jouant par lesdits Anglois ailleurs qu'audit hôtel.

So the English players, either ignorantly or wilfully, had flouted the monopoly of the Confrères and dared to perform elsewhere than at the Hôtel de Bourgogne. What, one wonders, induced them to take this action? Did they find it impossible to make both ends meet at the Hôtel de Bourgogne? Rigal, in his book *Hardy et le théâtre français*, tells of some of the difficulties undergone by companies who hired this theatre. The takings were probably not great, and were still further diminished by the number of people who had a right to enter gratis. A part of the hall had to be reserved for the use of the Confrères and their friends; members of the king's household might enter free of charge, and lackeys following their masters also slipped in without payment. So that after the fee due to the Confrères had been deducted there cannot have been a very wide margin of profit left for the players themselves. Probably the English comedians were driven to giving extra performances in another quarter in order to supplement their meagre earnings at the Hôtel.

We do not know whether Jehan Sehaiis or Shaw and his English company continued at the Hôtel de Bourgogne after this disagreeable encounter with the law. The entire absence, as far as can be ascertained, of any mention of them in contemporary records would seem to indicate that their stay was not long enough to make an impression on Parisian audiences. On the other hand, the next let recorded in the "Inventaire" is not until the 28th April 1599, and it seems improbable that the Confrères would have allowed their theatre to remain empty for ten months.

The only other reference to English comedians in Paris at this period which has hitherto been mentioned by literary historians occurs six years later in the Journal of Héroard.* Jean Héroard was appointed by Henri IV. in 1601 to be first physician to the Dauphin, afterwards Louis XIII. He was responsible for the

* *Journal de Jean Héroard*, edited by Soulié and Barthélemy, 1868, vol. i., pp. 88, 89, 91, 92.

child's health, and supervised all the details of his daily life. He grew very fond of his charge ; the little Louis saw far more of him than of his own father and mother, and seems to have returned the good physician's affection. Héroard's Journal is a minute and painstaking account, written down day by day, of the Dauphin's every action. The following is the first of the interesting entries referring to English comedians :

Septembre 1604, à Fontainebleau.

Le 18, samedi.—A trois heures et demie goûté ; mené en la grande salle neuve ouïr une tragédie représentée par des Anglois ; il les écoute avec froideur, gravité et patience jusques à ce qu'il fallut couper la tête à un des personnages . . .

Héroard does not tell us how this incident in the play affected the child, whether he was interested or frightened. He goes on briskly to the next event, and we learn that Louis was taken into the garden after the play and went to watch the hunt.

But the following entries show that the English actors made no small impression on the little prince, then aged about four. Ten days later Héroard makes the following observation :

Le 28, mardi.—

Il se fait habiller en masque, son tablier sur sa tête et une écharpe de gaze blanche, imite les comédiens anglois qui étoient à la Cour et qu'il avoit vu jouer.

This game proved fascinating, for the next day we read :

Le 29, mercredi.—

Il dit qu'il veut jouer la comédie ; " Monsieur, dis-je, comment direz-vous ? " Il répond : *Tiph, toph*, en grossissant sa voix. A six heures et demie, soupé ; il va en sa chambre, se fait habiller pour masquer et dit : *Allons voir maman, nous sommes des comédiens*.

And again on Sunday, 3rd October :

Il dit : *Habillons-nous en comédiens*, on lui met son tablier coiffé sur la tête ; il se prend à parler, disant : *Tiph, toph, milord*, et marchant à grands pas.

Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery ; the English comedians * evidently excited the interest and admiration of one

* It has been suggested that the head of this troupe of English performers was the Italian player Ganassa, and that his company consisted of Italians, English, and Spaniards—the Spanish players mentioned by L'Estoile in August 1604 being connected with it.

of their audience at least. And, as Jusserand remarks, the child's powers of observation were well developed; for we know that the loud voice and great strides—strutting and bellowing, as Hamlet unkindly puts it—were characteristic of English declamation at that time.

What was this tragedy played before Henri IV. and his little son at Fontainebleau during Shakespeare's lifetime? One or two attempts have been made to solve this question. Eudore Soulié, writing in the *Intermédiaire des chercheurs et des curieux* for June 1864, summarises the data relating to English comedians in the inventory of the Hôtel de Bourgogne and in Héroard's Journal and suggests that it would be interesting to discover "le personnel de ces troupes et les pièces de leur répertoire." In the following year (*Intermédiaire des chercheurs et des curieux*, tome ii. p. 105) Henry Charles Coote, the antiquarian and lawyer, attempted a reply. Ignoring the larger questions raised by Soulié, he confines himself to guessing what play it was that the Dauphin saw acted by the English comedians.

Coote suggests that the child's "Tiph, toph, milord," represents the English phrase "Tap for tap, my lord," spoken by Falstaff in *Henry IV.*, Part II., Act II., scene i. The complete phrase is: "This is the right fencing grace, my lord; tap for tap, and so part fair."

Coote seems to have forgotten the other piece of information which Héroard gives us about the play, namely, that "il fallut couper la tête à un des personnages." Evidently the play which the Dauphin saw contained fairly striking references to an execution. The only mention of an execution in *Henry IV.*, Part II., occurs at the end of Act IV., scene ii. The Archbishop of York, Lord Hastings, and Lord Mowbray have been arrested on the battlefield, and Lancaster orders them to be led away immediately to the "block of death, Treason's true bed and yielder-up of breath." The incident is not of central importance, and a child of four who did not understand English would probably not find it striking. Moreover, Héroard distinctly says "one of the characters," and here there are three prisoners who are to be put to death.

The most recent suggestion is that of Sir Edmund Chambers, who says "the theme may have been the execution of John Tiptoft, Earl of Worcester, at the restoration of Henry VI. in 1470." He also mentions in a note that the phrase "tiff toff" occurs as a stage

direction in the play *Lingua*, and is explained by Collier as hiccups; by Fleay as stage blows.

I venture to put forward another suggestion for what it is worth. The very slight indications which we have to go upon make it impossible to do more than guess at the identity of the play.

There is a well-known scene, turning upon an execution, in *Richard III*. Gloucester is determined to put Hastings to death, but before declaring his intention openly he plays with his victim. He asks him what punishment traitors deserve, and displays his misshapen arm, declaring that enemies have bewitched his body. Hastings, alarmed at his threatening expression, falters out:

If they have done this deed, my noble lord,—

Then Gloucester's full rage and vengeance burst forth. He shouts at him the famous words:

If! thou protector of this damned strumpet,
Talk'st thou to me of "ifs"?—Thou art a traitor:—
Off with his head!

It is an immense outburst, and it may well have been at this point that the little Louis began to sit up and take interest. "If, off." There is tremendous emphasis on those two words, and perhaps "Tiph, toph" is a child's rendering of the sounds. It is true that "my lord" does not occur in Gloucester's speech; but Hastings has just used the title twice. Also it is very probable that "milord" was the only English word known to the Dauphin and his attendants. They would hear the English ambassador and notable English visitors addressed by this title; it would therefore be quite natural for him to tack the expression on to his "Tiph, toph." Probably he imagined that these words meant "Cut off his head." Perhaps he pointed to Mme. de Monglat or to his dear Héroard as he strutted about the room, intending "Tiph, toph" as an order for their execution.

But all this is mere conjecture, and must remain so unless any further documentary evidence on the subject is brought to light. I had hoped to find some mention of this performance at Fontainebleau in the despatches of the English ambassador then at Paris; but Sir Thomas Parry makes no reference to any performance by English actors in his despatches for that year. However, among the Foreign State Papers at the Public Record Office I came across two letters which do add a little to our scanty knowledge of this subject.

Before proceeding to quote these letters, which have not hitherto been published, it would be as well to make clear the circumstances in which they were written. As I mentioned before, Sir Thomas Parry was English ambassador in Paris at this time, having succeeded Sir Ralph Winwood in 1602. Parry had as his secretary a very able young man who was afterwards to become a famous diplomatist. The young man's name was then simply "Mr." Dudley Carleton, but a brilliant career lay before him. He was afterwards ambassador at Venice and the Hague, and became Chief Secretary of State under Charles I. As secretary at the English Embassy in Paris he was then serving an apprenticeship to the diplomatic career.

Early in March 1602 Parry sent his secretary on a mission to Metz. The French king and court were visiting that town, and Carleton went thither to represent the ambassador at the Court and to transact some business with Villeroy relating to a certain "rembursement of her majesty's monie"—which errand did not meet with much success, as we learn from his letters to Parry. Before leaving Paris, Carleton had evidently requested his friends at the Embassy to let him know of anything which might occur during his absence. The relations of the secretary with his chief were not of the smoothest, as transpires from Carleton's letters home, and he was no doubt anxious to keep himself well informed as to the trend of affairs at the Embassy during his absence.

These letters, written from Paris to Carleton at Metz, are preserved in the Record Office; and those two of them which are of interest to us here describe an incident in which the English comedians figure. The more important of the two, from our point of view, is written by an Englishman called John Loveden; the other is from a French gentleman of the name of Saint Sauveur. Both these men were attached to the English Embassy. Saint Sauveur is spoken of as a "secretary." Loveden, judging by the style of his address to Dudley Carleton and by his rather ill-spelt letter, was perhaps a man of inferior position. But he also must have been some kind of secretary because several of the ambassador's later dispatches are in his handwriting.

The following is Loveden's letter * :

My good Mylord Carleton, We have not as yet heard any newes out of England. And for my parte I know nothinge heere worthie of relacon for that I fear my letters wilbe rather troublesome than any waies

* P.R.O. Foreign State Papers, 49.

answerable to expectacon, yet my promise and your desire hath constrained me to be unmannerlie and to writte havinge not occasion. I can certifie you of nothinge but that my lorde is in good healthe and the rest of the gent. in the house whoe remember their hartie comendacons. I am very unwillinge to trouble you with a folyshe mutinie our Welsche men made heere on Tuesday last, whoe in remembrance of that day as the Custome is weare a licke in their hatte. And these men heere in token of their rejoicyng went to a Taverne to be merry admittinge some of our Englyshe players into their companie, of which faulte some speache litle before your departure passed betweene us. Which players havinge not longe kept their rounde in the Taverne weere well charged, and one of them amongst the rest runneth out of the house with a legge of mouton in his hand, gnawinge it as he passed the streate. At which howe much the people weere offended you may judge. He went not farre but one of the Towne reprehended him for it, which this drunckard take(th) in ille parte and heere uppon drewe out his dagger and broke the poore man's heade. Whereuppon the people, very much offended, gathered themselves together at St. Germaines gate, neere unto which this fellowe was, where they had good stoare of stones which they threwe at all the Englyshe men as thicke as yf they had ben Hotte; but some of our companie havinge rapiers drawed them and ranne in amongst them and made all the Frenshe retire within the gate. Some of our house knowinge nothinge cominge neere unto the place weere in danger but none of them very muche hurte some twoe or three their faces and heades broken with stones but I marvaile howe they escaped soe well. I thinke the proverbe is true a druncken man will never take hurte. My lorde hearinge of it hath warned them to forbear the companie of these companions. I doubt I have been over bolde and therefore with very hartie comendacons I doe end.

Paris this 14th of Marche, 1603.

Yr. very lovinge friend to comand

JOHN LOVEDEN.

So there were English players in Paris in March 1603—that is to say, five years after the company we know of at the Hôtel de Bourgogne and one year before the performance at which the Dauphin was present. Evidently the actors of whom Loveden speaks had been in the town some time, because this was not the first occasion on which the "Welsche men" had consorted with them. This is clear from the phrase "of which faulte some speache litle before your departure passed betweene us." The "faulte" referred to is the unfortunate habit of the "Welsche men" who persisted in "admittinge Englyshe players into their companie." Loveden and Carleton must have talked this over together. The Welshmen were evidently attached to the Embassy in some capacity or other, and it would certainly be advisable to avoid as far as possible

any street altercations between Parisians and members of the English staff. The society of the English players was dangerous from this point of view, as the travelling companies evidently took with them their London habit of brawling in taverns. After this dreadful scene at St. Germain's gate, Sir Thomas Parry put his foot down, as we learn from Loveden: "my lorde hearinge of it hath warned them to forbear the companie of these companions." It is disappointing that Loveden gives no names. Can the gnawer of the leg of mutton have been our old friend Jehan Schais?

Saint Sauveur, writing four days later, refers to the same incident though in a very different style. John Loveden contented himself with a plain narration of facts. Saint Sauveur aims at scholarly elegance and wraps up the story of the riot in a wealth of classical allusion. He treats the affair as a humorous incident and adopts a tone of refined badinage. From our point of view, the Loveden manner with its straightforward narration of facts and inclusion of picturesque detail is to be preferred. Saint Sauveur's account is rather obscure. The following is an extract from his letter*:

Je vous diray que le Jour St. David les panachaches [*sic*] de queue de poreau selon leur sainte coustume se voulurent faire paroystre. Mais je ne scay par quelle fatalle destinée leur oroscope se trouva encernée du dieu Mars qui courrouce contre eux pour je ne scay quelle occasion les abandonna au pere Denis: qui apres les avoir menes tous(?) en son selier au Monst† les laissa à la Merci des Centaures qui ne se contenterent de les bien esbaudir mais encores leur offerent leurs glaives.

It is only with the aid of Loveden's account that we can endeavour to translate this parable. The "panachés de queue de poreau" are, of course, the "Welsche men," and the references to Mars and Dionysus only confirm what we already know—namely, that they were involved in a drunken brawl which began in a tavern, or, as Saint Sauveur prefers, in the wine-cellar of Dionysus (le père Denis). But it is not at all clear who are meant by the Centaurs. The fact that they encouraged (esbaudir) the Welshmen in their behaviour leads one to suspect that the players are intended. We are also told that the Centaurs offered them (*i.e.* the Welshmen) their swords. The only reference to swords in Loveden's letter is the phrase "some of our companie havinge rapiers drawed them and ranne in

* P.R.O. Foreign State Papers, 49.

† Montmartre? There is probably a pun intended here on Saint Denis and "le père Denis" (*i.e.* Dionysus).

amongst them and made all the Frenshe retire within the gate." By "our companie," Loveden may mean here the English as opposed to the French, and this would of course include the players. Saint Sauveur adds practically nothing to our knowledge of this affair. One could wish that the learned secretary had been rather more explicit and less allegorical.

Further research among the State Papers at the Record Office brought to light another fact which is of interest here. Sir Thomas Parry, in his dispatch of August 11, 1604,* adds the following postscript after his signature :

The king hath at this present signed a warrant under his hande, to one Browne an English Comedian, for ye transporting of doggs Beares and Apes etc. for his specyal pleasures, a sure argument of his martial intentions.

And again, on October 3 of the same year, he writes to Cranbourne † :

I heare with repayre unto your Lordship one Brown, to whom this king hath committed ye charge to provide hym sum beares and doggs etc. for his recreation. Certayn of my goode friends here about ye Court desyred me to help them to sum English mastifs, whom I would gladly gratify, the said Brown hath promysed to provide them for one if he may have lyve to pass. I pray your Lordship lett hym have your favourable meanes for licens to transport them.

The dates of these two letters are interesting. It will be remembered that the performance at Fontainebleau which Héroard records took place on September 18, 1604. Parry's two references to "one Browne an English Comedian" occur in August and October, that is to say, the month before and the month after the date given by Héroard. If this Browne was a member of the company which performed on that day, his presence in Paris in August and October would indicate that the English actors must have remained in Paris at least three months on this occasion, and if this was so they probably gave other performances.

It would be tempting to assert that we have here to do with that Robert Browne who was perhaps the best-known and the most successful of all the Elizabethan actors who travelled abroad. But, unfortunately, it seems almost certain that he and his company were performing at the Harvest Fair at Frankfort on Maine in 1604,

* P.R.O. Foreign State Papers, 51.

† *Ibid.*

and therefore they could not have been in Paris. There is, however, a good deal of uncertainty as to Browne's actual movements in these years, as the following quotation from Sir Edmund Chambers shows :

Robert Browne, for some years after the opening of his fourth tour at Frankfort in the spring of 1601, does not appear to have attached himself to any particular Court. He is found at Frankfort, with Robert Jones, in September 1602, at Augsburg in the following November and December, at Nuremberg in February 1603, and at Frankfort for the Easter fair of the same year. With him were then, but it would seem only temporarily, Thomas Blackwood and John Thare, late of Worcester's men, who had doubtless just come out from England, when Elizabeth's illness and death closed the London theatres. He is probably the "alte Komödiant," whose identity seems to have been thought sufficiently described by that term at Frankfort in the autumn of 1604.

It is also perhaps worth while pointing out that when in the service of the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel in 1595, Browne was sent over to England to fetch a consignment of bows and arrows. This seems rather a striking parallel to the errand which "one Browne an English comedian" performed for Henri IV.

There were several other Brownes in the profession, notably Edward Browne, William Browne, and John Browne. J. T. Murray (*English Dramatic Companies*, 1558-1642) mentions a Robert Browne showing puppets at Coventry and Norwich in 1638 and 1639. This Parisian Browne may have been one of the above. Curiously enough, Loveden, in another letter to Carleton, dated March 26, 1603, speaks of a certain "Robbin Browne," whom he calls "my very good friend." He further mentions that this Robbin is "sonne to Mr. Browne clerk of the greene cloth," and that he has "latelie come out of Italie and this day departeth towards Rouen." But I am afraid we cannot connect this "Robbin" with our English comedian. It is unlikely that Loveden, who shows such scorn of the players in his other letter, would ever have called one of them his very good friend.

This concludes all that we have hitherto been able to discover about this interesting subject. It is curious to think that on the eve of the birth of French classical drama, Elizabethan plays were represented in Paris by Elizabethan actors. The very year which saw the English actors performing at Fontainebleau witnessed also the birth of Jean Mairet, author of the first French drama on the classical model.

A BATH POETESS OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

BY OSWALD DOUGHTY

AT Bath in the early eighteenth century, many a poet and poetaster invoked the Muses, singing of Beauty sportive in the waters, or of Elegance, stately under the rule of Nash.

Is there a man of an eternal vein
Who lulls the town in winter with his strain,
At Bath in summer, chants the reigning lass,
And sweetly whistles as the waters pass ?

sings the poet Young. Pope too, influenced by Young's verses, refers in *The Dunciad* to these poets of the waters :

Each cygnet sweet, of Bath and Tunbridge race,
Whose tuneful whistling makes the waters pass.

But when Pope included these in *The Dunciad*, he could not have been thinking of Mary Chandler the Bath poetess; from whom on one occasion at least he himself derived inspiration.

Mary Chandler, born at Malmesbury in Wiltshire in 1687, was the daughter of a dissenting minister, who afterwards settled at Bath. Her brother, Samuel Chandler, who contributed a life of his poetical sister to "Cibber's" *Lives of the Poets*, was a man of some note in his day. In 1716 he became minister of the Presbyterian Church at Peckham. Nine years later his wife's fortune was lost in the bursting of the South Sea Bubble, and he became a bookseller at the Cross Keys in the Poultry without relinquishing his ministry. This business of bookseller he continued for two or three years. On February 14, 1725, Archbishop Wake wrote to the bookselling minister :

I cannot but own myself surprised to see so much good learning and just reasoning in a person of your profession, and do think it a pity you should not rather spend your time in writing books than in selling them. But I am glad, since your circumstances obliged you to the latter, that you do not wholly omit the former.

The concluding sentence refers to Chandler's *Vindication of the Christian Religion*. So valiantly did Mr. Chandler defend Christianity against the attacks of Deists and Papists, so earnestly Sunday by Sunday did he exhort the good Presbyterians of Peckham to lead a godly life, that in time the Universities of Edinburgh and Aberdeen voluntarily sent him their diplomas of Doctor of Divinity; and to these Academic honours, he was able to add an F.R.S. and F.A.S., while after his death his sermons appeared in four large and intimidating volumes. From the medallion frame which adorns the frontispiece, the learned doctor in wig and gown truculently glares at us, as if still anxious to continue his interminable theological disputations. But we cannot argue with him; we cannot even read his sermons; so we retire crestfallen to cultivate a less formidable acquaintance in the person of his sister, the little milliner and poetess of Bath.

Mary Chandler, who was some six years older than her reverend brother, was driven by poverty to open a millinery shop in Bath about the year 1705. At an early age she gave signs of poetic genius, as her brother informs us:

She was observed from her childhood to have a fondness for poetry, often entertaining her companions, in a winter's evening, with riddles in verse, and was extremely fond at that time of life of Herbert's poems. And this disposition grew up with her, and made her apply in her riper years, to the study of the best of our English poets.

After such beginnings she proceeded to send "many small copies of verses on particular characters and occasions, to her peculiar friends."

Unfortunately, the demands of the shop prevented regular studies, and the young poetess, longing to read Homer and Horace, found herself busily engaged in designing new frills and flounces for the fastidious beauties of Bath. The shop, indeed, as her brother ponderously informs us, rendered her

incapable of receiving that polite and learned education which she often regretted the loss of, and which she afterwards endeavoured to repair by diligently reading, and carefully studying the best modern writers, and as many as she could of the antient ones, especially the poets, as far as the best translations could assist her.

But Mary Chandler, despite adverse circumstances, was not to

be beaten. She would have said with Browning, if she had known him—

Because a man has shop to mind
In time and place, since flesh must live,
Needs spirit lack all life behind,
All stray thoughts, fancies fugitive,
All loves except what trade can give ?

So we find her in her moments of leisure reading Virgil, Horace, and Homer in translations, and expressing her opinions of them.

I have been reading Horace this month past, in the best translation I could procure of him. O could I read his fine sentiments cloathed in his own dress, what would I, what would I not give ! He is more my favourite than Virgil or Homer. I like his subjects, his easy manner. It is nature within my view. He doth not lose me in fable, or in the clouds amidst gods and goddesses, who, more brutish than myself, demand my homage, nor hurry me into the noise and confusion of battles, nor carry me into enchanted circles, to conjure with witches in an unknown land, but places me with persons like myself, and in countries where every object is familiar to me. In short, his precepts are plain, and morals intelligible, though not always so perfect as one could have wished them. But as to this, I consider when and where he lived.

As the Muses insistently urged her to creation, she naturally chose the one subject she had intimately studied, and wrote her once popular *Description of Bath*, a poem in the fashionable heroic couplet, which attained an eighth edition in 1767, twenty-two years after its author had died. The timid poetess was not blind to the poetic greatness of her subject or the magnitude of her task. Indeed, but for the inspiring thought of Princess Amelia, to whom her poem is dedicated, she would have been unequal to the arduous duty she had undertaken.

To sing the town where balmy waters flow,
To which Amelia's health the nations owe,
My Muse aspires ; while conscious blushes rise,
And her weak pinions tremble, ere she flies ;
Till, drawing vigour from those living springs,
She dares to raise her voice, and stretch her wings.
Not the fam'd springs, which gave poetic fire,
Had nobler virtues, or could more inspire.
Too weak my voice ; but great Amelia's name
Shall raise my numbers, and defend my fame.

In the event, Amelia's name proves to be sufficiently invigorating to sustain a poem of 322 lines. Mary Chandler first sings of the legendary founding of Bath, and then proceeds to a verse description of the famous waters,

The floating waters, from their hidden source,
Thro' the same strata keep unerring course ;
The flowing sulphur meets dissolving steel,
And heat in combat, till the waters boil :
United then, enrich the healing stream,
Health to the sick they give, and to the waters fame.

Then follows a description of Bath, with its buildings, groves, amusements, and famous Master of Ceremonies, the mighty Nash.

Nor think, O Nash, the Muse forgets thy praise,
Enough for thee this monument to raise :
What greater honour can thy pride receive,
Than that thy name with great Nassau shall live ?

In describing the Cross Bath she brings her beloved Horace to her aid.

Not far from hence, a bath of gentler heat,
The tender virgin finds a safe retreat
From sights indecent, and from speeches lewd,
Which dare not these, with satyr-face intrude.
Just in the midst, a marble cross there stands,
Which Popish minds with pious awe commands,
Devoid itself of pow'r to heal our woes,
Yet, deck'd with monumental crutches, shows
What mighty cures this wond'rous pool has done,
And these the trophies from diseases won.
The sailor thus, on foaming billows tost,
His ship and shipmates in the tempest lost,
Did some kind god's assisting pow'r implore,
And when, by aid divine he reached the shore,
Strait to the temple of the god he flew,
His briny coat he thought the temple's due :
And near the dripping garment, on the wall
He wrote, with grateful praise the moving tale.

This picture of the Cross Bath is very different from Defoe's, when he wrote :

Here the ladies and gentlemen pretend to keep some distance, and each to their proper side, but frequently mingle here too, as in the King and Queen's Bath, tho' not so often ; and the place being but narrow, they converse freely, and talk, rally, make vows, and sometimes love ; and having thus amused themselves an hour or two, they call their chairs and return to their lodgings.

Le Citoyen Chantreau, too, at the end of the century, gives us an interesting picture of the baths and the bathers.

Les femmes arrivent aux bains dans des chaises à porteur, qui sont hermétiquement fermées, lorsqu'elles sont laides, vieilles ou prudes ; et artistement pénétrables à l'œil, lorsqu'on a de belles formes à lui offrir.

If Mary Chandler ever took a Sedan chair to the baths, it must then have been a closed one, for like her idol the great Mr. Pope, she was deformed.

She had nothing in her shape to recommend her, says her brother, being grown, by an accident in her childhood, very irregular in her body, which she had resolution enough often to make the subject of her own pleasantry, drawing this wise inference from it, "That as her person would not recommend her, she must endeavour to cultivate her mind, to make herself agreeable." And indeed this she did with the greatest care; and she had so many excellent qualities in her, that though her first appearance could never create any prejudice in her favour, yet it was impossible to know her without valuing and esteeming her."

We are glad to learn, however, that

She had something extremely agreeable and pleasing in her face, and no one could enter into any intimacy of conversation with her, but he immediately lost every disgust towards her that the first appearance of her person tended to excite in him.

Agreeable Mary Chandler certainly became, by the exercise of her strong will and patience, and the good sense that was so marked a characteristic of her time. But whether she so easily reconciled herself to the loss of beauty, and all that beauty brings to a woman, we may take leave to doubt. "Those substantial acquisitions of true wisdom and goodness, which she knew were the noblest ornaments of the reasonable mind, and the only sources of real and permanent happiness," of which her brother so glibly speaks, inevitably failed to satisfy her cravings for a larger life. At times in her verses we find a note of regret, of struggle not yet ended, of abstract wisdom conceived in thought but still unrealised in life, of reason not yet triumphant over feeling.

In a poem she describes how one morning when Sir Harry and Lady Russell breakfasted with her at her cottage, the talk turned as usual on their favourite theme, "love and wedlock," and a possible husband for herself. Sir Harry jestingly proposed "G——," who seems to have been deformed also, saying—

Two bodies so exactly pair'd ! 'tis plain
Heav'n made the match, and destin'd him the man.

Lady Russell, however, disagreed, preferring the son of a farmer, who was present.

The young farmer, complaisant and kind,
 Bow'd, smil'd, and drank my health : an omen fair !
 But, ah ! a young and fairer maid was there.
 I fear my rival's charms, I fear her art :
 Each serve to move, and both to win his heart.

Thus she describes the incident ; but despite her having " resolution enough often to make it the subject of her own pleasantry " her deformity never quite lost its sting for her, and when she continues as follows, we feel that the somewhat coarse merriment had not been to her entirely laughable :

Thus far in mirth. But now for steady truth ;
 I'm climb'd above the scale of fickle youth.
 From pain of love I'm perfectly at ease :
 My person Nature never form'd to please.
 Friendship's the sweetest joy in human life :
 'Tis that I wish—and not to be a wife.

In time, at any rate, this renunciation was fully made. Year after year the poetess remained in her little shop selling her wares, saving her small gains, and in leisure moments writing her verses, without anything of romance meeting her. Clear in mind, firm in resolution, delicately cynical and always self-controlled, she continued to survey the small but brilliant world of Bath from her tiny shop-window, while life moved on steadily but not unkind.

In early days she had known bitter moments of revolt against her loveless and uncongenial lot.

The hurries of life into which her circumstances at Bath threw her, set frequently extremely heavy upon a mind so intirely devoted to books and contemplation as hers was ; and as that city, especially in the seasons, but too often furnished her with characters in her own sex that were extremely displeasing to her, she often, in the most passionate manner, lamented her fate, that tied her down to so disagreeable a situation ; for she was of so extremely delicate and generous a soul, that the imprudences and faults of others gave her a very sensible pain, though she had no other connexion with, or interest in them, but what arose from the common ties of human nature.

But this child of the age of reason would not be deterred in her attempt to reduce the rebel passions to obedience. Her deformity was associated with physical weakness.

At last, after many years' illness, she entered, by the late ingenious Dr. Cheney's advice, into the vegetable diet, and indeed the utmost extremes of it, living frequently on bread and water ; in which she continued so long, as rendered her incapable of taking any more substantial

food when she afterwards needed it ; for want of which she was so weak as not to be able to support the attack of her last disorder, and which I doubt not hastened on her death. But it must be added, in justice to her character, that the ill state of her health was not the only or principal reason that brought her to, and kept her fixed in her resolution, of attempting and persevering in this mortifying diet. The conquest of herself, and subjecting her own heart more entirely to the command of her reason and principles, was the object she had in view in this change of her manner of living ; as being firmly persuaded, that the perpetual free use of animal food, and rich wines, tends so to excite and inflame the passions, as scarce to leave any hope or chance, for that conquest of them which she thought not only religion requires, but the care of our own happiness, renders necessary. And the effect of the trial, in her own case, was answerable to her wishes ; and what she says of herself in her own humorous epitaph,

That time and much thought had all passion extinguish'd,

was well known to be true, by those who were most nearly acquainted with her.

So writes her brother, feelingly, somewhat ungratefully indeed, of " the vegetable diet " which, his biographer informs us, owing to " frequent and dangerous fevers," he too followed for twelve years. " This produced so happy an alteration in his constitution," we are told, " that though he afterwards returned to the usual way of living, he enjoyed an uncommon share of vigour and spirits till seventy."

To friendship, Mary Chandler devoted whatever remains of feeling the " vegetable diet " left to her.

Friendship, the heav'nly theme I sing ;
Source of the truest joy !
From sense such pleasures never spring,
Still new, that never cloy.

'Tis sacred friendship gilds our days,
And smooths life's ruffled stream,
Uniting joys will joys increase,
And, sharing, lessen pain.

So the dull days in the little shop were sweetened for her by the visits of friends, while now and again she would take a well-earned and welcome holiday, making short excursions to the homes of her acquaintances in the country round Bath. " She there enjoyed the solitude she loved, and could converse, without interruption, with those objects of nature, that never failed to inspire her with the most exquisite satisfaction." We are not surprised to find that so

simple and earnest a nature attracted many and influential friends. There were Mrs. Boteler, whose garden delighted the poetess ; Mrs. Stephens of Sodbury House ; Lady Russell and the Duchess of Somerset, friend of Shenstone and Thomson ; and the excellent Elizabeth Rowe, exponent of virtue and wisdom. Mary's brother waxes eloquent, not without pride, in giving his account of his sister's exalted friends. " 'Twould be endless to name all the persons of reputation and fortune whom she had the pleasure of being intimately acquainted with."

During these visits, released from the prosaic atmosphere of her shop, moved by the natural beauty about her, she would express her feelings in verse.

Romantic views these prospects yield,
That feed poetic fire ;
Each broken rock and cave and field
And hill and vale inspire.

These various, gay, delightful scenes
Like paradise appear ;
Serene as evening sky my soul,
And hush'd is ev'ry care.

In sickness she found new health as the guest of Mrs. Stephens at Sodbury House :

Scarce Eden's garden more divinely fair ;
Alike in fragrance is thy balmy air.
When bow'd by sickness nigh the gloomy grave,
Thy air reviv'd, and Heav'n vouchsaf'd to save.

Here, with the intensified joy of life that accompanies convalescence, the poetic nulliner drank deep of the delights of solitude amidst natural beauty. Perhaps some echo of Marvell lingered in her memory as she wrote :

Here hanging gardens rich with fruit appear ;
The golden apple and the mellow pear,
And nicer plants, their spreading arms extend,
To tempt the gath'ring hand of ev'ry friend.
On the smooth terras, set with evergreens,
I walk delighted with the lovely scenes ;
Where groups of trees around are artful spread,
And meet in verdant arches o'er the head.
Amidst the awful shades, from grove to grove,
In noonday's heat secure and cool, I rove.
Whence clouds of birds pursue their airy way,
When dawning beams proclaim the rising day ;
Rous'd from their leafy beds, they hail the light.
I gaze, delighted with the sound and sight !
And wait their wish'd return with rising night,

Then follows a description of a bird's-eye view of the landscape, that distantly recalls *Grongar Hill*; for Mary, with her admiration for Denham's *Cooper's Hill*, and Pope's *Windsor Forest*, is a lover of what Dr. Johnson termed "local poetry."

It was her love of solitude that brought her into literary relation to her great idol Pope. "The fine use she made of solitude, the few following lines she wrote on it will be an honourable testimony to her," says her brother, syntactically amok:

Sweet solitude, the Muses' dear delight,
Serene thy day, and peaceful is thy night.
Thou nurse of innocence, fair virtue's friend,
Silent, tho' rapturous, pleasures thee attend.
Earth's verdant scenes, the all-surrounding skies
Employ my wond'ring thoughts, and feast my eyes.
Nature in every object points the road,
Whence contemplation wings my soul to God.
He's all in all. His wisdom, goodness, pow'r,
Spring in each blade, and bloom in ev'ry flow'r,
Smile o'er the meads, and bend in ev'ry hill,
Glide in the stream, and murmur in the rill;
All nature moves obedient to his will.
Heav'n shakes, earth trembles, and the forests nod,
When awful thunders speak the voice of God.

And to these verses of the little milliner, the great Mr. Pope himself was indebted when he wrote one of the best-known passages in the *Essay on Man*:

All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
Whose body Nature is, and God the soul;
That, chang'd thro' all, and yet in all the same;
Great in the earth, as in th' ethereal frame;
Warms in the sun, refreshes in the breeze,
Glow's in the stars, and blossoms in the trees,
Lives thro' all life, extends thro' all extent,
Spreads undivided, operates unspent.

That Pope derived inspiration from her verses must have delighted Mary Chandler, for Pope was her literary idol. Her own ambition indeed was to write like her great contemporary.

Could I, like tuneful Pope, command the Nine;
Did my verse flow, and as it flows, refine;
Thus would I sing; but O, with grief I find
My feeble pen but faintly paints my mind!
Myself unequal to the great design,
The task to abler poets I resign.

With these verses she concludes her *Description of Bath*. Her admiration for Pope finds frequent expression in the small volume

of her published verses. Describing the amusements of fashionable society in Bath, she speaks of their

Fav'rite ombre, sweetly sung by Pope,

while elsewhere she sings of

Windsor Forest ever fair and gay,
Immortaliz'd by Pope's harmonious lay.

Her admiration for Pope's *Rape of the Lock*, leads her to introduce spirits in the guise of sylphs, descending to earth from "the Other World."

Each spirit has his task assign'd
As pleases best, or suits his mind.
Some to the central sun descend ;
Some to the neighb'ring planets tend ;
Nor some so small a place can bound,
As does old Saturn's annual round ;
But through the vast unbounded space,
Their Maker's works with rapture trace.
Of this small surface losing sight,
Amidst ten thousand worlds of light,
Some tune their golden harps, and sing
The boundless glories of their King ;
Or how from Chaos Nature rose ;
How central fires the scenes shall close.
How at the last important Day,
All shall the trumpet's voice obey,
With horror some, and some with joy.

Some on the kindest errands fly,
Adown the azure hilly sky ;
And whisper Celia in the ear, "
" Of yon deluding fop beware."
To Strephon, when the sparkling wine
Does to excess his soul incline,
" Exert the man, and fly the bait ;
See poison on the pleasure wait."
And, pointing to the tempting fair,
" Disease, ill fame and guilt are there."
Bid Reason guide his erring feet,
And ev'ry virtue grow complete ;
Bid Wit within due bounds confin'd,
Adorn, and not debauch his mind.
If Strephon's deaf, away they fly,
And, griev'd, they mount their native sky.
They leave him 'midst a lighter band,
Of airy beings still at hand ;
Who left the world with tainted breast,
With their own follies still impress'd,
Envious, deceitful, and unblest.
Who hover round with downward flight,
Visit in dreams at dead of night ;
Fill Mira's head with dukes and earls,
And equipage and costly pearls ;

Bid Strephon dance, and drink, and play,
Turn day to night and night to day ;
Till health and fame and fortune flies,
Strephon repents, despairs and dies.

These tuneful Pope calls gnomes and sylphs
These Britons took for fairy elves ;
The genius was the pagan name ;
They gave their Bards and sages fame ;
And Milton, Pope and Dryden fir'd,
And Clarke and Newton these inspir'd.

Mary Chandler's admiration of Pope was not unrewarded, for, as her brother informs us, " Mr. Pope favoured her with his friendship at Bath, and complimented her for her poem on that place." The momentous day when Mr. Pope praised her poetry was probably the happiest in Mary Chandler's life. Despite her modesty, she cannot refrain from telling us that Pope had praised her work. In verses thanking her friend and physician, Dr. Oliver, who had corrected her poem, she says, speaking of herself in the third person :

Ev'n Pope approv'd, when you had tun'd her lyre.

Nor was her brother less proud, apparently, of such notable commendation, for in another passage he tells us :

Her poem on the Bath had the full approbation of the publick ; and what sets it above censure, had the commendation of Mr. Pope, and many others of the first rank, for good sense and politeness.

Mary Chandler's interests were not confined to art. Religious doubts assailed her in youth, but these she fought so sternly as to win her brother's approval. At length she became a " firm and established Christian " ; her unhappiness departed and peace was restored. Her religion was undoubtedly a source of strength and consolation to her throughout her life, but we can learn nothing more of its nature, than that it was " rational and prevalent." Life had not always been the calm stream that she would make it appear in her verses.

She used frequently to complain of herself, as naturally eager, anxious, and peevish. But, by a constant cultivation of that benevolent disposition, that was never inwrought in any heart in a stronger and more prevailing manner than in hers, she, in a good measure, dispossessed herself of those inward sources of uneasiness, and was pleased with the victory she had gained over herself, and continually striving to render it more absolute and complete.

We are not surprised to find this disciple of "the vegetable diet" expounding the virtue of Temperance :

Fatal effects of luxury and ease !
 We drink our poison, and we eat disease ;
 Indulge our senses at our Reason's cost,
 Till sense is pain, and Reason's hurt, or lost.
 Not so, O Temp'rance bland ! when rul'd by thee,
 The brute's obedient, and the Man is free.

'Tis to thy rules, O Temperance ! we owe
 All pleasures, which from health and strength can flow,
 Vigour of body, purity of mind,
 Unclouded reason, sentiments refin'd.

In her self-conscious devotion to reason, Mary Chandler was the child of her age. To a friend she writes warningly :

Your sprightly wit that all admire,
 Is an unlicens'd lawless fire.
 Restrain its wild, impetuous course,
 And give your Reason all its force ;
 And let that reason be your rule.

Elsewhere she complains that

Not often Reason guides us ; more, caprice,
 Or accident or fancy.

So the days passed in the little shop, days now tempered to a not unpleasant monotony. Behind her counter Mary Chandler dreams without bitterness of life as she would have it, might she but refashion it to her heart's desire. Under the influence of her favourite Horace, her dreams find expression in verse, and like many in her day she writes a poem, *My Wish* :

Would Heav'n indulgent grant my wish
 For future life, it should be this :
 Health, peace, and friendship I would share ;
 A mind from business free, and care ;
 A soil that's dry in temp'rate air ;
 A fortune from incumbrance clear,
 About a hundred pounds a year ;
 A house not small, built warm and neat,
 Above a hut, below a seat ;
 With groups of trees beset around,
 In prospect of the lower ground,
 Beneath the summit of a hill,
 From whence the gushing waters trill,
 In various streams, that winding flow
 To aid a river just below ;
 At a small distance from a wood,
 And near some neighbours wise and good,
 There would I spend my remnant days,
 Review my life, and mend my ways.

I'd be some honest farmer's guest,
 That with a cleanly wife is blest :
 A friendly cleric should be near,
 Whose flock and office were his care :
 My thoughts my own, my time I'd spend
 In writing to some faithful friend
 Or on a bank, by purling brook,
 Delight me with some useful book,
 Some sage, or bard, as fancy led ;
 Then ruminate on what I'd read.
 Some moral thought should be my theme,
 Or verdant field, or gliding stream :
 Or flocks, or herds, that shepherds love :
 The shepherds would my song approve.
 No flatt'ry base, nor baser spite,
 Not one loose thought my Muse should write ;
 Nor vainly try unequal flight.
 Great George's name let poets sing,
 That rise on a sublimer wing :
 I'd keep my passions quite serene,
 My person and apartment clean,
 My dress not slovenly, but mean.
 Some money still I'd keep in store,
 That I might have to give the poor :
 To help a neighbour in distress,
 I'd save from pleasure, food and dress.
 I'd feed on herbs, the limpid spring
 Should be my Helicon—I'd sing ;
 And be much happier than a king ;
 Thus calmly see my sun decline :
 My life and manners thus refine :
 And acting in my narrow sphere,
 In cheerful hope, without one care,
 I'd quit the world, nor wish a tear.

To such a limited conception of happiness had Mary Chandler attained by the exercise of much will and patience and that practical good sense so characteristic of the age, when suddenly for the first and last time in her life, romance broke in upon the quietude of her days, momentarily quickening the rhythm of her now placid existence.

Even in youth, owing to her deformity, the little milliner abandoned all thoughts of marriage, and now at fifty-four her thoughts and wishes, as her poem shows, were far indeed from any such possibility. Yet it was this very poem, *My Wish*, which brought a distant and unknown admirer unexpectedly to her feet. "A country gentleman of worth and large fortune," having read her *Wish*, was so attracted by the goodness of the character portrayed, that he travelled "an hundred miles to visit her at Bath," and made his formal proposal.

For a moment the shock flung the little milliner from her paved pathway of good sense and routine, stony but now plain and tranquil

journeying, into the turbulent stream of life. One restless night she passed in anxious self-questioning, but with dawn came her fixed resolve, and peace. The years of hard self-discipline, of habit, of vegetable diet and routine had done their work effectively, and the struggle was neither long nor stern. This call to live filled her with terror, the terror of the uncertain and the unknown. Besides, it was now too late. Thirty years ago she would have welcomed it, but not now. It would mean, too, leaving the past, and the past had laid hold of her, binding her by tender, sentimentalized memories of things sweeter to her in the recollection than in reality; days spent in Mrs. Boteler's garden writing her verses, or at Sodbury House, or with the Duchess of Somerset at Marlborough Mount.

These things could not be left; they were proved and certain sources of real, if limited, happiness. There, she was on solid ground; but she had lost that station and turbulent, probably treacherous, waters were about her. It was all very disturbing, even terrifying. She must get back to the firm and stony pathway her philosophy had so wisely marked out. So after one night of mental turmoil, the little milliner rejected the call to a wider life for which in the past she had so longed, and the impetuous lover set out from Bath discomfited, to make his long return journey alone.

Mary Chandler's duties at the shop were resumed without further interruption, but her mind naturally dwelt upon this most exciting incident of her quiet and monotonous existence. The poet in her led her to tell the story in verse, which she showed to a friend. The friend, Mary Chandler complains in a note to her publishers when sending the verses to be added to her other poems, "made it so public that it now grows troublesome, and has tired my pen to transcribe." So about two years after the event, a new edition of Mary Chandler's poems appeared containing in addition to those published before, *A True Tale*, wherein the romantic proposal is chronicled.

In these verses she tells us how

His person pleas'd, and honest was his fame.

At my shop
I saw him first, and thought he'd eat me up.
I star'd, and wonder'd who this man could be,
So full of complaisance; and all to me:
But when he'd bought his gloves, and said his say,
He made his civil scrape, and went away.

I never dreamt I e'er should see him more ;
 Glad when he turn'd his back, and shut the door
 But when his wond'rous message he declar'd,
 I never in my life was half so scar'd !

Fourscore long miles, to buy a crooked wife !
 Old, too ! I thought the oddest thing in life :
 And said, " Sir, you're in jest, and very free ;
 But, pray, how came you, Sir, to think of me ? "
 This civil answer I'll suppose was true :
 " That he had both our happiness in view.
 He sought me as one form'd to make a friend,
 To help life glide more smoothly near its end ;
 To aid his virtue, and direct his purse ;
 For he was much too *well* to want a nurse."
 He made no high-flown compliment, but this :
 " He thought to've found my person more amiss.
 No fortune hop'd ; and, which is stranger yet,
 Expected to have bought me off in debt !
 And offer'd me my *Wish* which he had read ;
 For 'twas my *Wish*, that put me in his head."
 Far distant from my thoughts, a husband, when
 Those simple lines dropt, honest, from my pen !

Much more he spake, but I have half forgot ;
 I went to bed, but could not sleep a jot.
 A thing so unexpected ! and so new !
 Of so great consequence !—So gen'rous too !
 I own, it made me pause for half that night :
 Then wak'd, and soon recover'd from my fright ;
 Resolv'd, and put an end to the affair :
 So great a change, thus late, I could not bear ;
 And answer'd thus : " No, good Sir, for my life,
 I cannot now obey, nor be a wife.
 At fifty-four, when hoary age has shed
 It's winter's snow, and whiten'd o'er my head,
 Love is a language foreign to my tongue :
 I could have learnt it once, when I was young ;
 But now quite other things my *Wish* employs ;
 Peace, liberty, and sun, to gild my days.
 I dare not put to sea so near my home,
 Nor want a gale to waft me to my tomb.
 The smok of Hymen's Lamp may cloud the skies ;
 And adverse winds from diff'rent quarters rise.
 I want no heaps of gold ; I hate all dress,
 And equipage. The cow provides my mess.
 'Tis true, a chariot's a convenient thing ;
 But then, perhaps, Sir, you may hold the string.
 I'd rather walk alone my own slow pace,
 Than drive with six, unless I chuse the place.
 Imprison'd in a coach, I should repine :
 The chaise I hire, I drive, and call it mine.
 And, when I will, I ramble, or retire
 To my own room, own bed, my garden, fire ;
 Take up my book, or trifle with my pen ;
 And, when I'm weary, lay them down again :
 No questions ask'd ; no Master in the spleen—
 I would not change my state to be a Queen.
 Your great estate would nothing add to me,
 But care, and toil, and loss of liberty.

Your offer does me honour, I confess ;
And, in your next, I wish you more success.

And thus this whole affair begins and ends :
We met as lovers, and we parted friends.

So, with the added charm of a quaint, half-serious humour, Mary Chandler describes the scene. And behind all other motives in her action, there lies the one she expressed to her publisher, in prose, "to suppose a man can be a lover at sixty, is to expect May-fruits in December. But esteem and friendship often borrow that name."

Shortly after this great event, the little milliner put up the shutters of her shop for the last time. During the thirty-five years of uncongenial duties, she had saved sufficient to procure the modest competence she desired in the *Wish*. It was now time, she felt, to possess

A mind from business free, and care,

a more congenial environment, in which to spend her "remnant days." Nor were those "remnant days" to be long. Some four years of life remained to her, and these she spent in planning and attempting a poem more ambitious than any she had previously written. Before the work was completed, death came to her.

"She was meditating," says her brother, "a nobler work, a large poem on the Being and Attributes of God, which was her favourite subject ; and if one may judge by the imperfect pieces of it which she left behind her, in her papers, would have drawn the public attention, had she lived to finish it."

So this humble disciple and contemporary of Pope died as she had lived, striving to follow in the literary path of her idol. The "imperfect pieces" of her last poem mentioned by her brother have not come down to us, but we may guess that they were influenced by the *Essay on Man*.

A year after Pope she died,

quitting the world in a manner agreeable to her own wishes, without being suffered to lie long in weakness and pain, a burthen to herself or those who attended her : dying after about two days' illness, in the 58th year of her age, Sep. 11, 1745.

Long before, Mary Chandler, like Pope and Swift, Gay and Prior, and almost every poet and poetaster of the early eighteenth century, had written her own epitaph.

Here lies a true maid, deformed and old ;
 That she never was handsome, ne'er needed be told.
 Tho' she ne'er had a lover, much friendship had met ;
 And thought all mankind quite out of her debt.
 She ne'er could forgive, for she ne'er had resented ;
 As she ne'er had deny'd, so she never repented.
 She lov'd the whole species, but some had distinguish'd ;
 But time and much thought, had all passion extinguish'd.
 Tho' not fond of her station, content with her lot ;
 A favour receiv'd she had never forgot.
 She rejoic'd in the good that her neighbour possess'd ;
 And piety, purity, Truth she profess'd.
 She liv'd in much peace, but ne'er courted pleasure ;
 Her book and her pen, had her moments of leisure.
 Pleas'd with life, fond of health, yet fearless of death ;
 Believing she lost not her soul with her breath.

Nor did she deceive herself as to the value of her poetic excursions. In the dedication of her poems to her brother, John Chandler, she says, with characteristic humility and good sense :

I am far from assuming any airs on account of this mean performance ; but would rather chuse to be taken notice of as one that deals honestly in trade, and behaves decently in the relations of life, than as a writer ; since I am conscious I have a better right to the first, than the last character.

Mary Chandler is not the least charming of the many women of the eighteenth century, who had the wisdom to conceive and the will to practise a " reasonable " philosophy of life.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ASPECTS OF SOME STUART DRAMATIC MANUSCRIPTS

BY C. J. SISSON

ALL the manuscripts of Shakespeare's plays have been lost, with the possible exception of a fragment, *Addition D* in *Sir Thomas More*, which many strong arguments have sought to establish as his authentic autograph. We have only rough approximations to typographical facsimiles of the manuscript copy sent in to the printers of the First Quartos, and of the First Folio in the case of plays which were not printed in Quarto editions. It is of the utmost importance to understand the nature of this copy and to interpret correctly the evidence of these printed witnesses to the facts concerning the manuscripts.

There are, it seems to me, two ways of approaching this investigation. It has been approached directly from the printed texts which have original authority as being printed for the first time, and from manuscript, either in a Quarto or in the First Folio. The evidence implicit in the printed texts, and perceptible to the trained observer, has been interpreted in this way by Professor Dover Wilson in the various volumes of the New Cambridge Shakespeare. This method has yielded interesting results. It has furnished the solution of some textual difficulties, and has permitted of many brilliant conjectures concerning the general character of the copy for the printed texts or particular anomalies evident in them. The most frequent type of evidence used is that which indicates bibliographical disturbance, that is, interference with or revision of the original manuscript. For example, where irregular or broken verse-lining is found, it is held to show that the original copy has undergone revision.

In some instances confirmation has been sought for conjecture by adducing parallels in the existing manuscript of *Sir Thomas*

More. There is here a hint of the alternative way of approach to this investigation which I wish to advocate. The printed texts may be studied in the light of a preliminary examination of all the extant manuscripts of Elizabethan and Stuart plays, with a view to bibliographical problems. This examination would furnish a classification of the various types of copy that might make their way from the author or from the playhouse to the printer. It would, for example, suggest the frequency of transcriptions of plays for stage use superseding the author's original copy. It would provide authentic examples of revision and interference by author, stage-adaptor, and censor working over the manuscript. We could thus work forward from the manuscript, deducing the probable effect of these disturbances in a printed copy, and so arrive at a classified analysis of the types of bibliographical anomalies likely to occur. This would be a valuable guide to conjecture and serve either to check or to confirm the results of the direct method of approach, which works backwards from the printed texts.

The material for such a study is abundant. Indeed, a surprising number and variety of manuscripts have survived and are available for examination in the public libraries. There are Elizabethan plays and Stuart plays. Some are author's autograph, some transcribed by other hands for use as stage copies or as copies for private patrons. Some bear the marks of author's corrections, some of work done upon them by stage-adapters or censors. There are different types of manuscripts by one dramatist. *Beleeue as you List* is an autograph manuscript of Massinger, *The Parliament of Love* a copy by a scribe from his manuscript. There are various examples of the work of one scribe. The MS. of *The Honest Man's Fortune* is a transcript by a scribe who signs himself JHON after writing *ffinis*. This same Jhon is the stage-adaptor of *Beleeue as you List*, and also, as Dr. Greg pointed out to me, the copyist of the British Museum MS. of *Bonduca*. There are, indeed, examples of almost every way in which the text of a play might go forward from its author to the stage or the printing-house, and of the experiences that might befall it on its journey. The one thing missing is an actual printer's copy. No manuscript has survived the handling of the compositor. Most of the manuscripts are of plays that were not printed until modern times. But the exceptions would repay study. There are manuscripts of two of the plays of Beaumont and Fletcher, *Bonduca*, and *The Honest Man's Fortune*, which were

printed in the 1647 Folio. A descriptive hand-list of all the extant manuscript plays is a great desideratum.

I propose here to take three of these manuscripts, and to deal with examples of interference with the text such as offer parallels to anomalies observed in the printed texts of Shakespeare's plays. In every case the actual cause of the anomaly that would arise is different from that conjectured to explain the similar anomaly in Shakespeare's text.

Massinger's autograph manuscript of *Beleeue as you List* is MS. Egerton 2828 in the British Museum. Here we have a play revised throughout by the author himself from his own original, the original having been refused a licence by the censor on account of its political bearing. It is a remarkably clean manuscript, and the chief signs of revision are the sporadic survivals of the names of characters in the original cast, such as *Don Sebastian* in the dialogue and *Hermit* in a speech-heading, or of places such as *Venice*, deleted by the author or by a stage-adapter but still legible. The play has been prepared for the stage by an adapter, who has entered the stage directions, notes and names of actors necessary to make it serve as a prompt copy, in place of or in addition to those entered by the author. Finally the manuscript bears the licence, dated 1631, of the Master of the Revels, Sir Henry Herbert, and on the remains of one leaf, almost entirely torn off, indications of his censorial corrections.

In the Victoria and Albert Museum there are, among others in the Dyce Bequest, two MS. copies of plays by Fletcher, *The Honest Man's Fortune*, MS. Dyce 9, and *The Faithful Friends*, MS. Dyce 10, both transcripts. The former play has been "reallowed" by the Master of the Revels, as "being an olde One and the Originall Lost," in 1624. The "Originall," however, evidently was available for the 1647 Folio.

These three manuscripts present instances of textual disturbance which would give rise in print to the phenomena of False Verse-Lining, Repeated Passages, "Ghost" Parts, and Variant Speech-Headings, with which I proceed to deal in turn.

False Verse-Lining.

There is, in *Beleeue as you List*, a striking example of such a disturbance of the text as would lead to false verse-lining if the copy had gone to the printer. It is due to the stage-adapter. On

Folio 20 *recto* a passage of three lines has been crowded in, in the English variety of his hand, at the foot of the page in the right-hand corner. He utilises a space left there by Massinger's original text. The passage may thus be represented, showing the adapter's writing in heavy type :—

	I will not throwe it of.
FLAMINIUS:	I pine with envie to see his constancie
Metell :	bid your propertie enter & vse her subtlest magicqe /
The Lute strikes & then the songe:	Sempro : / I haue already aquainted her with her cue, the musique vshers her personall appearance.

Now if this page of the MS. came to a compositor he would certainly print it accordingly with a false lining, thus :

METELL.	bid your propertie enter & vse her subtlest magicqe.
SEMPRO.	I haue already acquainted her with her cue, the musique vshers her personall appearance.

The reason for this disturbance of the text is made clear on turning the page. At the top of Fol. 20 *verso* we find the passage repeated in Massinger's hand, part of the text as originally written, but lightly deleted by the adapter, and with a different and correct verse-lining. The original sequence of lines ran thus :

METELL.	to see his constancie bid your propertie enter / & use her subtlest magicqe.
SEMPRO.	I haue already / acquainted her with her cue. the musicqe ushers / Her personall appearance.
ANTIOCHUS.	from what hand / and voice doe I receaue this charitie

The adapter has taken the trouble to insert these lines at the foot of the leaf, and to delete them on the following leaf, simply because it was more convenient for the prompter. Preparations are being made for a song, the stage direction is given "The lute strikes & then the songe," but before the song is actually sung this short speech of Sempronius must be spoken. It is therefore transferred to the preceding page, so that all the matter connected with the song is on one page and the prompter can turn over at his leisure during the song.

This crushing of matter at the foot of a page occurs in other instances, in order to finish a scene on the page in question. Here also it appears to lead to corrupt lining, as in *The Honest Man's*

Fortune, Fol. 28 *recto*, and in *The Faithful Friends*, p. 40, though deletions also have a hand in the latter. The same thing happens in *Sir Thomas More*, on Fol. 8 *verso*, on the second of the Three Pages of Hand D, and again at the foot of Fol. 9 *recto*, at the end of D.'s Addition. Other instances of false verse-lining occur in *Beleeue as you List*, due to the author himself. There is the simple case of two lines run on into one, with various explanations of the error. On Fol. 26 *verso* we have the following :—

 nere to discover it wch heaven can witnes, I haue & will keepe faithfullie.
COR. this is
 the kinge Antiochus as sure as I am

"I haue . . . faithfullie" was evidently omitted in copying and crowded in when Massinger discovered the omission, there being no room to insert it in its proper place as a separate broken line completed by the first two words of the next speech.

On Fol. 22 *recto* there is a line originally an Alexandrine but converted by the author's afterthought in free composition into two lines in one. Massinger first wrote in a verse speech of Berecynthius

to make three sopps for his three heades may serue for breakefast,

and then inserted above the line "that" after "may," and "somethinge more then an ordinarie" after "for," so that the line now runs :

to make three sopps for his three heades that may serue for somethinge more
then an ordinarie breakefast.

This would certainly come out as a prose patch in the printing, instead of appearing as two free lines of verse.

There is a more complicated example on Fol. 14 *verso* :

FLAMINIUS. your travayles ended. mine begins, and therefore
 [sans ceremonie] I will take my leaue formalitie of manners now is vselesse.
LENTULUS. I longe to be a horsebacke.
 you haue my wishes

Here the words "formalitie . . . vselesse" have been added after omission in copying, as the writing shows, a complete line having been omitted. Having set this right, Massinger deletes "sans ceremonie," apparently to correct the scansion and probably on re-reading. Presumably he scans thus :

I will take my leaue formalitie of manners
now is vselesse. I longe to be a horsebacke

and forgets that he has already completed this last half line with "you haue my wishes" following.

In general, author's, adapter's, reviser's, or censor's deletions, corrections and additions lead to frequent upsetting of the metrical scheme. I ought, however, to point out that censorial and other excisions do not always cause metrical disturbances. Instances may be found where either author, adapter, or even censor appears to have had some concern about the matter, or in which the metrical fate of the lines has been curiously kind. We find, for example, that where two half lines have been left at the beginning and end of a deletion they occasionally complete one another, and the metre is left unscathed, as in *The Faithful Friends*, p. 4 :

LEARCH. Tullius is generall and wth greatest pompe
is coming this way, [the kinge leaning thus
vpon his soldier] eying as they passe

This is a censorial deletion. It is not unreasonable to imagine that a man like Herbert, serious and conscientious, of a literary family, might like to exercise his skill in this direction. To conclude upon this, where metrical disturbance is observed, there is clearly a great variety of causes to be taken into consideration in seeking to draw conclusions from it. But the number of possible causes is limited none the less, and it may be feasible to fasten on the particular cause at work more often than one might at first sight expect, in the study of printed texts.

Repeated Passages.

Possible alternative explanations of passages repeated in a printed text, such as those dealt with by Mr. Dover Wilson in his editions of *Love's Labour's Lost* and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, may be suggested by *Beleeue as you List* and *The Faithful Friends*. In the former, the passage transferred by the adapter to the foot of Fol. 20 *recto* and lightly deleted on Fol. 20 *verso* might well have been printed twice over, especially if a compositor started his stint at Fol. 20 *recto*.

It is abundantly clear that deleted passages were printed frequently. For example, the printers of the 1647 Folio of Beaumont and Fletcher's *Works* print, with a very few exceptions, the passages which are deleted in the Dyce MS. of *The Honest Man's Fortune*, whether deleted by the adapter or the censor.

On pages 11, 12 and 13 of *The Faithful Friends* there is a long passage deleted by the adapter. Obviously the cut is made to shorten the play for acting. After the cut, a couple of lines, slightly altered from a deleted passage, are marginally re-inserted in the subsequent dialogue. I cannot enter here into the interesting question of the hands in this MS., but the main text is by a transcriber, who leaves gaps, some of which are filled up in the same hand as that in which this passage is entered. Now if this play had been printed by a contemporary, instead of by Weber's printer from Weber's text in 1812, we should have had a passage repeated with some slight variation from a previous passage in the same scene, and incidentally a patch of prose in a verse passage.

Once more, we have to consider a variety of possible causes for this type of bibliographical disturbance, and walk warily.

Ghost Parts.

In the first stage-direction of the Quarto *Much Ado about Nothing* we read "Enter Leonato gouvernour of Messina Innogen his wife, Hero his daughter, and Beatrice his neece, with a messenger." *Innogen* appears again in the stage-direction to Act II. sc. i., but has no part in the play or in the dialogue. She is what is conveniently called a "ghost," and it has been argued that a "ghost" of this kind is evidence of revision of an earlier play or of severe cutting. *Beleeue as you List* furnishes an example of other ways in which "ghosts" may be raised by the author and adapter with the help of the printer. The Roman envoy in this play, Titus Flaminus, is provided by the author with two freedmen, Calistus and Demetrius, and a third henchman, Titus, who first appears in Act III. sc. i. to carry out certain detective duties. But their individuality tends to evaporate as the play progresses. I subjoin the relevant stage directions as the adapter and the author conceive them. Heavy type indicates the adapter's writing, square brackets his deletions, and round brackets Massinger's own deletions. Under "Remarks" A. = Adapter, M. = Massinger.

The adapter, it will be observed, frequently notes the names of the actors who are to play the parts in question.

SCENE.	ADAPTER.	MASSINGER.	REMARKS.
I. II.	Ent: flaminus : Calistus: Demetri	Enter Titus flaminus. Calistus. Demetrius 2 freedmen.	walking-on parts.
		ex. flaminus cum suis	

SCENE.	ADAPTER.	MASSENGER	REMARKS.
II. i.	Ent: flaminivs. & Calistus R: Bax	flaminivs & Calistus exit Calistus	Baxter is to play Calistus a speaking part. Sent to Carthage.
	Ent: Demetrius Wm Patrick	[enter Demetrivs.]	Patrick plays Demetrius.
	Ent: Chrisalus Geta: Syrus: Demetrius:	enter [Calistus] Demetrius Chrysalus. Geta Syrus.	M. confuses Calistus with Demetrius, and A. puts it right. Small speaking part.
	Demet [Calistus] Demet [Calistus]	[Calistus] [Calistus]	Speech heading, twice put in error by M. and corrected by A.
III. i.	with 2 letters Ent: flaminivs & Calistus. Demetrivs Mr Hobs. & Rowland:	[Ent:] flaminivs Calistus. Demetrivs	Hobs and Rowland now play these parts, instead of Baxter and Patrick
	Ent: Titus: R: Bax:	[Enter Titus.]	Small speaking parts. Baxter wanted for Titus, a larger speaking part
III. ii.	Ent: flaminivs & R: Baxter	[enter flaminivs. & Titus: Demetrivs.] exit Demetrivs	M. now confuses Demetrius and Titus. Demetrius has been sent to Syracuse or Sardinia. A. first puts M.'s s.d. right, then deletes it all and enters his own, with the essential, the actor. The exit he leaves as unimportant.
III. iii.	Ent: Antiochus: Queene Philoxenus: Berecinth: 3: Marchio: R: Bax: & Attendants	enter Antiochus. Queene Philoxenus. Berecinthivs the 3 marchants. Demetrivs. attendants	M. sticks to Demetrius and A. leaves it alone but rewrites the whole s.d. in the left margin.
IV. i.	Ent: flaminivs	[Enter (De) flaminivs flaminivs]	M. has Demetrius on the brain, starts writing it instead of Flam. A. makes doubly sure.
IV. iii.	Ent: Berecinthius: & I: Hony: R: Bax: & Gard:	officers leading in (Sampayo) Berecinthius: & the first marchant with halter.	M. first slips in the first incarnation of Bere. J. Honyman plays I Merchant. Baxter is now simply an "officer" of Flam., to which Titus has dwindled.
V. i.	Ent: flaminivs & R: Bax:	[Enter (marcellus) flaminivs & Demetrivs]	Baxter again is Flam.'s officer, Titus according to A., Demetrius according to M.
V. ii.	Ent: Marcellus: flaminivs: Cornelia: Moore woman: R: Bax: Rowl: & others	Enter marcellus. flaminivs. Cornelia moore woman & servants.	Baxter is still merely attached to Flam., and his name does not matter.
	Ent: R: Bax: with swords	enter servant with many swordes	Demetrius, Calistus, and Titus have disappeared. There is nothing to choose between Baxter and Rowland here.
	Ent: Rowland with swords:	enter another servant with more swordes.	

It would seem pretty clear from this that the stage adapter, who is solely concerned with the action and business, may take upon himself to economise on characters. Here he struggles for a while with these somewhat uniform policemen of Flaminivs, then finally merges

two of them into one, Baxter playing both parts as one, however the author conceived of them. The author himself is capable of confusing all three, and this is equally instructive. So also is the fact that Calistus and Demetrius can be played each by two different actors at a short interval. It is frequent nowadays for one actor to double two parts, but hardly for one part to double two actors! Baxter, it will be noticed, plays two parts of a similar nature also at a short interval. It does not seem that such parts were seriously differentiated. One can easily imagine that the adapter could obliterate altogether parts originally conceived and named by the author, and leave their names in the stage directions, as Demetrius is left here, after his obliteration, or even leave references to them in the dialogue.

There is then a possible alternative explanation again to this feature of certain Shakespearean texts, without having recourse to a theory of fundamental revision.

Variant Speech-Headings.

The preceding discussion of the adapter's interference with the parts as conceived by the author, and of the author's own confusion of minor parts, shows further what possibility there is of abnormal speech-headings without postulating different authors for the part of the text concerned. Further, the adapter in writing stage-directions, working on Massinger's copy and with Massinger's spelling staring him in the face, spells names after his own fashion. He writes *Philoxenes* for *Philoxenus*, *Prusius* for *Prusias*, *Chrisalus* for *Chrysalus*. So in transcribing *The Honest Man's Fortune*, the same scribe, on Fol. 10 *recto*, leaves a very pretty confusion between *Laverdine*, *Laverdure*, and *Laverduer*. He settles down finally to *Laverdure*, whereas the 1647 Folio reads uniformly *Laverdine*. The differences are not striking in these instances, as it happens, but this is accidental. The principle is important. Now, it happens occasionally in *Beleeue as you List* that Massinger omits the speech-heading, especially in the parts where he is re-copying his first draft. Here the adapter inserts the omitted speech-headings, as the writing shows. Clearly he would spell them after his own fashion. Had Titus-Demetrius in the later scenes been a speaking part we might well have had a speech-heading *Baxter*. Massinger is a particularly careful writer, and we may imagine that such omissions would be more frequent at an earlier date and in Shakespeare's

manuscripts. A series of omitted speech-headings inserted by an adapter might well have been added to a passage of Shakespeare's own composition. The evidence of speech-headings may not necessarily force us to disintegrating conclusions.

I have done no more here than to open up the possibilities of this avenue of approach to the bibliographical problems of Shakespeare's plays. I have by no means exhausted the indications of even the small field of these three plays. For example, I mentioned in passing the occurrence of a patch of prose in a verse passage in *The Faithful Friends*. Again, *Beleeue as you List* furnishes precise examples of the type of error made by an author in original composition, by an author copying his own draft, and by a scribe copying an author's original text. The evidence adduced is perhaps sufficient, however, to show that a complete survey of the whole field of dramatic manuscripts would amply repay the labour involved. Incidentally, other interests would sustain the surveyor's attention, notably the study and comparison of handwritings and evidence bearing upon the production and acting of plays.

THE DATE OF GEOFFREY OF MONMOUTH'S HISTORY

BY E. K. CHAMBERS

THE *Historia Regum Britannie* certainly existed in some form by January 1139, in which month it was seen at the Abbey of Bec in Normandy by Henry of Huntingdon, who afterwards sent an abstract of it in a letter to a friend called Warinus. It has, however, been thought that the text, as we have it in the printed editions and a number of manuscripts in the British Museum and elsewhere, may represent a later revision, completed perhaps about 1148. The case for this theory, as put by H. L. D. Ward (*Catalogue of Romances in the British Museum*, i. 209), rests partly upon certain discrepancies between Henry's abstract and the known text, partly upon the statement of Alfred of Beverley, who made an abridgement of the *Historia*, that when he began his work about 1149 the mouths of many were full of *narraciones de hystoria Britonum : notamque rusticitatis incurrebat, qui talium narrationum scientiam non habebat*.

I do not find this evidence very convincing. It is, however, no part of my present object to discuss it, but rather to call attention to a passage in the *Historia* which, as it stands, may point to a date of composition later than 1139. In Book ix. ch. 12, Geoffrey enumerates the vassals of Arthur who attended a Pentecost feast at Caerleon upon Usk. Among others, he tells us :

Uenerunt nobilium ciuitatum nobiles consules. MORVID consul Claudiocestrie. MAVRON Gwigornensis. Anarauth SALESBERIENSIS. Artgualcar. gueitensis. *que nunc WARWIC appellatur*. Jugein ex legecestria. Cursalem ex Kaicestria. Kinmarch dux dorobernie. Galluc Salesberensis. Urbgenius ex BADONE. Jonathal dorocestensis. Boso Ridochensis. id est oxenefordie.

I have given the text of *Cotton MS. Titus*, c. xvii. f. 34^v. This is the oldest of the B.M. MSS., and was dated by Mr. G. F. Warner

about 1160. But substantially the same list, subject to orthographic variants and some others, more curious, described below, appears in all the other twelfth or early thirteenth century MSS. which I have consulted. Of these there are six in the B.M. : *Arundel MS.* 10 (f. 97^v), *Harl. MS.* 225 (f. 59), *Royal MS.* 13, D. ii (f. 160^v), *Royal MS.* 4 C. xi. (f. 243), *Addl. MS.* 15732 (f. 68), *Stowe MS.* 56 (f. 167^v) ; and three in the Bodleian : *MS. Lat. Misc.* e. 42 (f. 44^v), *Rawl. MS.* C. 152 (f. 165), *Fairfax MS.* 28. The list appears also in a MS. probably older than any of these. This is *Leyden Univ. MS. Lat.* 20 (f. 90^v), a composite MS. which has been identified from its contents by Delisle (*Bibl. de l'École des Chartes*, lxxi. 511) with one described by Robert de Torigny in his catalogue, drawn up not later than 1154, of the library at Bec. Delisle says that "selon toute apparence," it is the copy cited by Henry of Huntingdon. If this is so, it rather disposes at any rate of Mr. Ward's evidence for a revision of the *Historia*, since it is clear from some notes, for which I have to thank the kindness of Dr. W. W. Greg, that the *Leyden MS.* does not differ from others as regards the two most crucial points upon which Henry's abstract presents discrepancies. I doubt, however, whether Delisle is going upon anything but conjecture and, if so, it is just as easy to conjecture that, if Geoffrey did revise the *Historia*, the new edition had replaced the old one at Bec before 1154.

And now, where did Geoffrey get his list from ? The personal names need not trouble us. One, Boso, is the name of an Abbot of Bec, who ruled from 1124 to 1136. In giving his name to an Earl of Oxford, Geoffrey is of course punning on *bos*. The other names are taken at random from a set of Welsh genealogies closely resembling those attached in *Harl. MS.* 3859 to the *Historia* of Nennius. The place-names—Claudiocestria (Gloucester), Gwigornensis (of Worcester), Salesberiensis (of Salisbury), Cargueitensis (of Warwick), Legecestria (Leicester), Kaicestria (Chester), Dorobernia (Canterbury), ex Badone (from Bath), Dorocestensis (of Dorchester), Ridochensis (of Oxford)—all, I believe, with the exception of Bath, easily explained by the importance of the battle of Mons Badonis in the *Historia*, represent or conceal the names of twelfth-century earldoms. These were, of course, indifferently derived from the shires they covered and from the chief towns of those shires. It is not irrelevant that Geoffrey's patron, Robert of Gloucester, is described as "consul," instead of the usual "comes"

of Gloucester in his charters to Burford and St. Peter's of Gloucester (R. H. Gretton, *Burford Records*, 295, 302; W. H. Hart, *Hist. et Cart. Mon. S. Petri Gloucestriae*, ii. 10, 48, 89, 135). The history of the earldoms during the time of Stephen has been well explored, notably by Mr. J. H. Round in his *Geoffrey de Mandeville* (1892), to which my page numbers refer.

Henry I. died on December 1, 1135. There were then seven earldoms, if the "difficult and obscure" title of Buckingham is neglected (272).

Gloucester (Robert Fitz-Roy);
Warwick (Roger de Beaumont);
Leicester (Robert de Beaumont);
Chester (Randulf);
Surrey (William de Warenne);
Northampton (David of Scotland);
Huntingdon (David of Scotland).

One was created by Stephen, probably while he was still undisputed king, c. 1136 (271; cf. *Arch. Journal*, xxi. 47; G.E.C.):

Worcester (Waleran de Beaumont).

In June, 1138, Robert of Gloucester renounced his allegiance to Stephen; in September, 1139, the Empress Matilda landed to claim the crown; on February 2, 1141, Stephen was captured at Lincoln; and on April 7 Matilda was accepted as *domina* or queen elect of England by an ecclesiastical council at Winchester. She was never crowned, but as *domina* she created earldoms. Stephen rewarded his adherents in the same way, both before his capture and after his liberation on November 1, 1141; so that the earldoms of the "Anarchy" of 1138-53 fall into two rival lists, deriving their authority from the charters of competing sovereigns.

These are the earldoms of Stephen (271):

Derby (1138, Robert de Ferrers);
Yorkshire (1138, William de Aumâle);
Pembroke (1138, Gilbert de Clare);
Bedford (1138?, Hugh de Beaumont);
Lincoln (1139-40?, William de Roumare);
Essex (1140, Geoffrey de Mandeville);
Norfolk (by February, 1141, Hugh Bigod);
Arundel (by Christmas, 1141, William de Albini);
Hertford (by Christmas, 1141, Gilbert de Clare).

The precise dates are not very material.

These are Matilda's earldoms (82, 271) :

Cornwall (c. April, 1141, Reginald Fitz Roy) ;
 Devon (by June, 1141, Baldwin de Redvers) ;
 Dorset, or Somerset (by June, 1141, William de Mohun) ;
 Hereford (July, 1141, Miles of Gloucester) ;
 Oxford (1142, Aubrey de Vere) ;
 Wiltshire (by 1149, Patrick of Salisbury).

If Geoffrey's list be compared with those of Henry, Stephen, and Matilda, it seems apparent that, approximately at least, he recognised all the pre-anarchic earldoms (assuming Worcester to be one), and of the anarchy only those created by Matilda. He has Gloucester, Warwick, Leicester, Chester, Worcester, Dorset, Oxford, and Salisbury. But where are Surrey, Northampton, Huntingdon, Cornwall, Hereford, and Devon, and why does he add Canterbury ? The addition of Bath I have already explained. Can we bring the approximation nearer to equivalence ? I think we can.

(a) Geoffrey had no need to include *consules* of Cornwall, Northampton, and Huntingdon, for he had already named kings of Cornwall and Scotland as present at the feast, and although Northampton was apparently transferred by Stephen to Simon de Senlis (264), Geoffrey would not *ex hypothesi* take account of this.

(b) A glance at Geoffrey's list, as given in the *Cotton MS.*, will show that it contains both "Anarauth Salesberiensis" and "Galluc Salesber[i]ensis." The duplication is almost certainly due to a textual error. It recurs in *Bodl. MS. Lat. Misc.*, e. 42. But all the eight other MSS. which I have consulted show attempts to correct it. Dr. Greg tells me that the original scribe of the *Leyden MS.* wrote "anaraut salisberiensis," but that "a hand only a little later" has endeavoured to substitute "salopetiensis." On the other hand, the *Arundel MS.* and *Royal MS.* 4 C. xi. leave Salisbury to Anaraut and describe Galluc as "seropesberiensis" and "seropesberiensis." The *Harleian MS.* and *Fairfax MS.* omit Galluc altogether. Incidentally the latter also omits Boso and ends the list with "Jonathal dorchecestrensis, id est Oxinfordie ;" I do not know whether this is a mere slip, or whether the scribe was more familiar with the Dorchester in Oxfordshire than with the Dorchester in Dorsetshire. The *Rawlinson MS.* originally had the duplication, and omitted Urbgenius of Badon and Jonathal of Dorchester, whose names should have occupied a complete line after that of Galluc. But the entry of Galluc has been imperfectly

obliterated with pumice. On the other hand, the *Addl. MS.* omits Anaraut. The scribe whose work underlies *Royal MS.* 13 D. ii. meant to do the same, but by a slip omitted Artgual also, so that his text reads "mauron wigornensis *que* nunc warguic appellatur." The text of the *Stowe MS.* is practically the same. Obviously the *Leyden MS.*, *Arundel MS.*, and *Royal MS.* 4, C. xi., are aiming at the same earldom, "Salopesberiensis" or "Sciropesberiensis" (of Shrewsbury). Some similar reading must underlie the Welsh *Brut*, which has (J. G. Evans in *Y Cymmrodor*, xxiv. 39) "Anarawt o Amwythig" (Shrewsbury) and "Gwallawc ap lleenauc o salsbri." There was, however, no earldom of Shrewsbury or Shropshire in Stephen's reign. That held, with the earldom of Arundel, by the house of Montgomery had expired on the treason of Robert de Bellême in 1102, and was not revived with that of Arundel by Stephen for William de Albini, to whose wife Adeliza its estates had been granted by her former husband, Henry I. (322). Shrewsbury, therefore, was probably an emendation of the twelfth century itself. And there must have been an alternative reading by the time of Wace, the MSS. of whose *Roman de Brut*, based upon the *Historia*, yield (ff. 10453-10900) in a list similar to Geoffrey's, "Galluc" of "Cicestre" (*Royal MS.* 13 A. 21, f. 86^v), "Baluc" of "Silcestre" (*Bibl. Nat. Cangé MS.* 63), "Balut" of "Silcestre" (*Arsenal MS.* 71), "Baluc" of "Cilcestre" (*Cott. MS. Vitellius*, A. x. f. 88), "Balduf" of "Silsestre" (*Bibl. Nat. Cangé MS.* 27), and by a new duplication "Balduc" of "Glocestre" (*Harl. MS.* 6508, f. 68). Wace may only have had another emendation before him. On the other hand, Geoffrey might, I suppose, have invented an earldom of Silchester, or less plausibly Cirencester, just as he did of Bath. I have, therefore, Wace's authority, for what it is worth, against me, when I suggest that what underlies the duplicate "Salesberiensis" is really "Surreiensis."

(c) Certainly Hereford is not in the texts of Geoffrey's list, and the omission seems an odd one, in view of the devoted service of Miles of Gloucester to Matilda. Again, I believe, we have the scribes to thank. It must have been in a text known to Wace, for all the MSS. of the *Roman de Brut* cited above, except *Cangé MS.* 27, which has a shortened list of only seven names, yield a "Gurguint," or some such name (the "Guurgint" of the Welsh genealogies) of "Hereford," "Herford," "Herefort," "Herrefort." Hereford must have slipped out from the MSS. of the *Historia*, and the

addition would bring up Geoffrey's *consules* to the round number of twelve.

(d) There was no earldom of Canterbury or Kent in Stephen's reign. One has been assigned to William of Ypres, but Mr. Round (270) is clear that there is no evidence for this. Dare I suggest another scribal corruption? All the ten MSS. of the *Historia* consulted have "dorobernie" in full or "dorobernie," except the *Addl. MS.* which has "dobernie," with "rv" superscript over the 'o,' being apparently one of many interlineated corrections in this MS. Was it an erroneous correction, and did Geoffrey really write "defnie" or "debnie" (of Devon)? I do not know, however, whether the OE. *Defna* ever got so Latinised. The nearest forms I can find are the "Dibnenia" and "Dibuenia" of the *Vita Gildæ* (Mommson, *Chronica Minora*, iii. 109).

If I have made out my case as to the basis of Geoffrey's list, it seems to follow that this passage at least must have been written or revised. Conjectures are but conjectures; but, if mine are right, it seems difficult to resist the conclusion that Geoffrey based his list of "consules" upon that of the pre-anarchic English earldoms, as extended by Matilda's, but not by Stephen's, new creations. And it follows that this passage at least of the *Historia* must have been written or revised later than the creation of the earldom of Oxford in 1142, on some date before June 7 (165). How much later depends upon Patrick of Salisbury. He was not Earl of Wiltshire when Aubrey de Vere's charter was given, for Wiltshire was still open as one of the alternatives for Aubrey to choose from. And he was Earl by April 13, 1149, when he attested a charter given by Henry Fitz-Empress at Devizes (409).

SOME PLACE-NAMES AND THE ETYMOLOGY OF "SHE" *

BY A. H. SMITH

THERE are certain place-names in the north of England and in Scotland which illustrate a peculiar sound development in English. O.E. initial *he*—in these cases shows a tendency to become late M.E. *sh*—[*ʃ*]. When the survey of English place-names is further advanced, more material will probably come to light and will either substantiate or modify my explanations, which are, of course, put forward quite tentatively. The following notes are illustrated by some English place-names :

Shap (Co. Westmoreland) :

Hepp, 1176 Dugdale (vii, p. 869).

Hepe, 1228 Cl.

Hep, 1231 F.F. ; 1247 Ch. ; 1293 Cl.

Heppe, 1297 Var. ; 1314 Inq. p.m.

Yhep, 1241 Sedgfield.

Shap, 1332 Cl.

Sedgfield's derivation from O.E. *heope* "wild rose-bud," etc., is not suitable in meaning. More probably it is from O.E. *hēap*, used in the sense of "hill," which agrees very well with the topography of the place. O.E. *hēap* is not adduced with this meaning, but the sense-development from "heap" to "hill" is not difficult to explain.

Shapinsay (Orkney Isles) :

Hjálpandisøy, Scandinavian Sagas.

Hjálpandisay, c. 1225 Johnston.

Schapinshaw, 1529 Johnston.

The first element seems to be connected in some way with O.N.

* The following abbreviations are used : Ch.=*Calendar of Charter Rolls* ; Ch.W.=*Whitby Chartulary* (*Surtees Soc.* 72) ; Cl.=*Cal. of Close Rolls* ; D.B.=*Domesday Book* ; Dugdale=*Monasticon Anglicanum* ; F.F.=*Pedes Finitum* ; Inq.p.m.=*Cal. of Inquisitions p.m.* ; Johnston=*Place-names of Scotland* ; L.S.=*Yorks. Lay Subsidy* (*Yorks. Archeol. Soc.* 21) ; N.V.=*Nomina Villarum* (*Surtees Soc.* 49) ; P.R.=*Pipe Rolls of Henry II.* ; Sedgfield=*Place-names of Cumberland* ; Var.=*Calendar of Various Chancery Rolls*.

hjálpandi, "helper, saviour." The second element is O.N. *øy*, "island."

Shawm Rigg (Whitby, North Riding, Co. York) :

Halmerigg, 1214-1222 Ch.W.

Shalmerigge, c. 1355-1372 Ch.W.

There is some doubt about the meaning of the first element. Professor Ekwall (*Introduction to the Survey of English Place-Names*, p. 92) suggests O. Scand, *Hjalm-hryggr*. A more likely derivation, however, is O.N. *hálmr*, "straw," or rather the O. Anglian cognate *hālm* or *hēalm*, "straw, stubble" (Bosworth and Toller's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, and the supplement). The modern form in *Sh-* should be derived from O.E. *hēalm*. On the change *Shalme* → *Shawm*-, pronounced (ʃɔm), cf. Cowling, *The Dialect of Hackness*, § 96.

Shetland (off the north of Scotland) :

Hjaltland, Icelandic Sagas (Vigfusson).

Heland, later Icelandic Sagas.

Zetlandie, 1403 Johnston.

Note also *Hjaltar* "Shetlanders." On the etymology, cf. the O. Icelandic nick-name *Hjalti* (Vigfusson's *Icelandic-English Dictionary*, s.v.). The loss of *l(-tl-)* in the island name appears to be early, and is probably due to dissimilation, caused by the difficulty in pronouncing the combination *-tl-* in local habits of articulation; this seems the more probable as the combination *-lt-* is preserved in the name *Hjalti*, which appears as the modern name of the Shetland pony, viz. *Sheltie* (cf. A. W. Johnston, *The Year Book of the Viking Society*, vol. v., p. 51).

Shipton (Bulmer Wapentake, North Riding, Co. York) :

Hipton, 1086 D.B.

Hepeton, 1167 P.R.

Hyepton (*Yhieptona*), 1176 P.R.

Hieptunam, 1308 Ch.

Schippeton, 1291 Inq. p.m.

Schupton *Galtres*, 1301 L.S.

Schupton, 1316 N.V.

The first element seems to be O.E. *heopa*, "briar, bramble," or O.E. *heope* "hip, seed vessel of the dog-rose"; the second element is O.E. *tūn* "inclosure, farmstead": cf. *Heptonstall*, West Riding, Co. York (Moorman, *West Riding Place-Names*, s.v.).

The first stage in the change *he-* \rightarrow *sh-* is the development of a palatal consonant [j] before *-e-*. There is evidence of this having taken place in the case of O.E. initial *e-* (cf. Smith, *The Place-Names Jervaulx, Ure, and York*, Anglia XXXIV. (*Neue folge*), p. 291 ff.), but the development rested at that. In the case of O.E. *he-*, however, *h-* was still preserved and the palatal consonant [j] developed before *-e-* apparently in the late twelfth and early thirteenth centuries, as evidenced by the forms *Yhep* (Shap), and *Hyepton*, *Yhiepton*, *Hieptunam* (Shipton). The initial sound combination would now be [h j], which easily tends to become [ç j] (as in the modern pronunciation of the personal name *Hugh* [ç jū]). This combination [ç j] is acoustically very similar to the pure consonant [j], and the latter, being easier to produce, naturally displaced the more difficult [ç j].

From the little material given, the date of this development is not easy to determine, but [j], written *sch-*, appears as early as 1291: *Schippeton* (Shipton), and is the only form adduced in the succeeding centuries. The exact provenance, too, is difficult to ascertain. It certainly did take place in the north, and the place-name survey of the East Midland district of England may reveal similar developments there.

The vowel immediately following O.E. *he-* in this type of word appears to be preserved in the case of O.E. *hēa-* as in *Shap*,* *Shapinsay*, *Shawm Rigg*. The vowel development in *Shetland* and *Shipton* is somewhat obscure, though the forms *Zetlandie* (probably for *zetlandie*, etc.) are no doubt due to a Scandinavian mutation caused by the preceding *-j-*, and the form *Schupton* may be due to an obscure vowel development, possibly caused by variant stress on the diphthong elements, as *héop-* (giving *schippe-*) or *heóp* (giving *schup-*).

These notes, of course, open again the question of the origin of the modern English pers. pronoun, 3rd sg. fem. *she*. The editors of *A New English Dictionary* (Oxford) suggest that *she* is derived from O.E. *sio*, *sie*, which in some O.E. dialects, through stress-shifting, became (syó, syé), and add that "it is not surprising that (syé, syó) became (jē, jō)." There is no doubt that O.E. *heo* "she," the normal O.E. pers. pronoun, 3rd sg. fem. became M.E. *seo*

* The early spellings *Hep*, *Hepp*, *Hepe* of Shap may not represent a pure vowel [ē], as is usually supposed, but rather a sound acoustically near to it and represented phonetically by [e[~]]. The difficulty is in the interpretation of M.E. written *-e-*.

(Lagamon), *hie*, *hio* (MS. *hye*, *hyo*: Mat. i, 19), *ghe*, *ge* (Gen. and Ex.), *zhe* (Will. of Palerne), *zho* (Ormm), *zho*, *zo* (P.L.S.), all quoted from Stratmann-Bradley's *Middle English Dictionary*, s.v. *heo*. The forms given by the same authority under M.E. *scheo* are *scæ* (c. 1150, A.S. Chron.), *sche* (Will. of Palerne), *sche* (Gen. and Ex., Langland MS. A., Havelock), *scho* (Havelock, Miro, Iwaine, Gawaine, Cursor Mundi), etc. The distribution of the forms shows that *heo* in its various forms belongs to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, that *scheo* and its variants belong to the thirteenth and following centuries (excluding the isolated A.S. Chron. *scæ*), and that *zhe*, *sche*- forms belong rather to the south, whilst the *zho*-, *scho*-forms are more prevalent in northern M.E. texts. M.E. *scho* is still found in Yorkshire dialects as [fū], [fu], and M.E. *sche* has given the modern standard English *she* [ʃi], [ʃi].

The editors of *A New English Dictionary* passed over the theory that modern English *she* was derived from O.E. *hēo* through the absence of independent evidence of a native sound development to explain the change *hēo* > *she*, *sho*. But the evidence of the place-names dealt with above shows that a development of O.E. *he*- to M.E. *sch*- did take place, which could explain the derivation of modern English *she* from O.E. *hēo*, especially as the periods when M.E. *zhe*, *zhe* and M.E. *sche*, *scho* were prevalent agree more or less with the periods when *He*-, *Hy*, *Yh*- and *Sch*-, *Sh*- were prevalent in the place-names. The whole theory stands for more in the North (rather than in the Midlands), for it is there where the development is for the present evidenced in place-names.

The general tendency of the change in the cases dealt with may be summarised as follows :

O.E. *hzo* → $\begin{cases} heō > hjō > cjō > fē > fā \\ hēo > hjē > cjē > fē > fī \end{cases}$ "shoo" (Yorkshire).

O.E. *hza* → $\begin{cases} heā > hjā > cjā > fā \\ hēa(hjā) > hjē > cjē > fē \end{cases}$ Shap, Shawm Rigg.

O.E. *hza* → $\begin{cases} heā > hjā > cjā > fā \\ hēa(hjā) > hjē > cjē > fē \end{cases}$ Shetland (Scandinavian sound-change).

NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS

VERSE TESTS AND THE DATE OF *SIR THOMAS MORE*

IN the July number of *The Review of English Studies* my friend Mr. G. B. Harrison writes as to the three pages in *The Book of Sir Thomas More* which have been claimed as Shakespeare's, that (assuming for the sake of argument that the three pages are indeed Shakespeare's) :

It seems difficult on internal evidence to place the *More* speech before *Julius Cæsar* ; indeed, if the rhythmical tests, which are usually applied to date Shakespeare's plays, count for anything, it is later. It is still more difficult to believe that Shakespeare could have written it between 1595 and 1597.

Mr. Harrison arrives at this conclusion from the number of internal stops in the speech. " In 41 lines," he writes, " there are no less than 10, that is (if we may reduce such things to figures) 1 in 4. In what play of Shakespeare do we find a long speech with the same proportion ? "

When I read this challenge the trial scene in *The Merchant of Venice* came to my mind, and from the trial scene I can produce two speeches which together contain internal stops in almost identically the same proportion as in *More*.

The first is Shylock's speech (IV. 1. 89-103) :

What judgement shall I dread, doing no wrong ?
You have among you many a purchased slave,
Which, like your asses and your dogs and mules,
You use in abject and in slavish parts,
Because you bought them : shall I say to you,
Let them be free, marry them to your heirs ?
Why sweat they under burthens ? let their beds
Be made as soft as yours, and let their palates
Be season'd with such viands ? You will answer
" The slaves are ours " : so do I answer you :
The pound of flesh, which I demand of him,
Is dearly bought ; 'tis mine and I will have it.
If you deny me, fie upon your law !
There is no force in the decrees of Venice.
I stand for judgement ; answer ; shall I have it ?

Here of fifteen lines no fewer than six have internal stops. The second is even better known, being Portia's speech (ll. 184-205) :

The quality of mercy is not strain'd,
It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven
Upon the place beneath : it is twice blest ;
It blesseth him that gives and him that takes :
'Tis mightiest in the mightiest : it becomes
The throned monarch better than his crown ;
His sceptre shows the force of temporal power,
The attribute to awe and majesty,
Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings ;
But mercy is above this sceptred sway ;
It is enthroned in the heart of Kings,
It is an attribute to God himself ;
And earthly power doth then show likest God's
When mercy seasons justice. Therefore, Jew,
Though justice be thy plea, consider this,
That, in the course of justice, none of us
Should see salvation : we do pray for mercy ;
And that same prayer doth teach us all to render
The deeds of mercy. I have spoke thus much
To mitigate the justice of thy plea ;
Which if thou follow, this strict court of Venice
Must needs give sentence 'gainst the merchant here.

In this speech of twenty-two lines, five have internal stops, so that, taking it with Shylock's as quoted above, we find 11 internal stops in 37 lines, as against 10 internal stops in 41 lines in *More*. The number of lines without any end-stop (according to the punctuation in the Globe edition, from which I am quoting) is 10 in these thirty-seven lines as against 9 in the *More* speech as punctuated by Mr. Harrison. I think therefore that my quotations offer a good answer to his challenge, for to object to my relying on two speeches instead of one would be to substitute for a verse-test a length-of-speech test, which is quite a different thing. On the other hand, my object in this "note" is purely defensive, *i.e.* to show that the number of internal stops offers no obstacle to Shakespeare, if he was the author of the three pages, having written them earlier than Mr. Harrison thinks possible. I am quite sure that in any given scene Shakespeare's subject-matter and the temper in which he approached it count for quite as much as the date at which he was writing, and that to try to date a single scene solely by verse-tests, apart from temper and subject-matter, is dangerous. Temper and subject-matter may vary from scene to scene. They also may vary from play to play. While, therefore, I quite agree with Mr. Harrison that the "three pages" are not at all like anything we find in *Richard II.*, I demur to his statement that "*More*'s speech does not

belong to the period of *Richard II.*," if by period we mean so many months or years. According to the accepted chronology between the completion of *Richard II.* and the *Merchant of Venice* coming on the stocks, there can only have been quite a short interval (some months in 1594 and 1595), and I cannot myself see any difficulty in Shakespeare having written this speech of More about the same date as the *Merchant*.

ALFRED W. POLLARD.

THE RESTORATION PLAY LISTS

To Mr. Allardyce Nicoll and his profound researches in the history of the Restoration theatres all students of the English drama are deeply in debt. I must, however, remonstrate that one of his minor conclusions does not seem to be warranted by the facts. Mr. Nicoll is attracted by his hypothesis that there existed as sources of the Restoration versions of Shakespeare's plays, perhaps still exist, certain prompt copies or corrected quartos not now known or accessible to the learned world. In his *Dryden as an Adapter of Shakespeare* Mr. Nicoll even ventured to hope that some of these lost copies may eventually turn up and throw new light on the true text.

An article in the first number of the *Review of English Studies* * reiterates this view. It is, to put the case very mildly, open to grave doubt. The source of the Restoration version was not "some quarto unknown to us" or "some MS. prompt-book." As a rule the adapter follows a single text, which can usually, and except where there has been more than ordinarily violent alteration, be readily identified. Most of these sources have, as a matter of fact, long ago been spotted by indefatigable Germans; there is a German doctoral thesis on practically every one of the Restoration versions.

My own collations have invariably pointed to the general conclusion that until after the publication of the Fourth Folio, and except in the case of plays not printed separately before the Restoration, the source of the adapter is regularly the latest pre-Wars

* A. Nicoll, "The Rights of Beeston and D'Avenant in Elizabethan Plays," *Review of English Studies*, i. 84-91.

quarto. I use the term pre-Wars rather than pre-Restoration because the separate editions issued between 1642 and 1660 do not appear to have made their way into the libraries of the theatres; and it was through the actors that the independent texts of the quartos preserved their independence and their continuity, at least up to the publication of the fourth folio in 1685. Collation, that grand shibboleth of modern scholarship, was simply not a practised art in the seventeenth century. And so the quartos of Shakespeare's plays went gaily on, heedless except very rarely of the folios text, and then almost invariably with every appearance of casual coincidence, and quite unconcernedly repeating, in edition after edition, absurdities which a glance at any one of the folios would have cleared up. The quartos give us, in fact, the players' versions; and when a Restoration publisher, impelled by a successful revival or the first appearance of a popular actor in a new rôle, decided to take advantage of renewed public interest in one of Shakespeare's plays, he went presumably to the theatre and secured from the actors their latest text. Hence the term, quite accurate, "players' quartos." Hence, too, the unimportance, as sources of Restoration texts, of the quartos of 1655, issued while the theatres were closed. Thus the Restoration text of *Othello*, as I shall set forth in another article, is directly derived from the second quarto, that of 1630; the third quarto, that of 1655, is well known to be a poor reprint of the second, and is in fact a dead end, the main track of the quarto texts proceeding directly from 1630 to 1681.

In the case of the Restoration *Hamlet*, to which Mr. Nicoll makes frequent reference in his *Rights of Beeston and D'Avenant*, the facts are no less certain, as I have pointed out in my *Hamlet under the Restoration*.^{*} With characteristic modesty Mr. Nicoll claims as the basis of his inferences only "a brief examination" of his Restoration texts. I have examined all the Restoration versions of Shakespeare, altered and unaltered; but the entire text of the 1676 *Hamlet* I have collated exhaustively with Furness's textual notes, with an original copy of the quarto of 1637, and with reprints of the first and second quartos. Considerations of space as well as a decent regard for the comfort of my readers deterred me from reciting in the article mentioned all the passages which establish the quarto of 1637 as the sole source of the Restoration

^{*} H. Spencer, "Hamlet under the Restoration," *Publ. Mod. Lang. Ass'n. of Am.*, xxxviii. 770-791 (Dec. 1923).

text before adaptation. But I gave citations which I thought sufficiently copious to place the question of source beyond doubt, whether or not my readers were willing to follow me in ascribing the adapted text to the ministrations of Sir William D'Avenant. My conclusions regarding the 1673 and 1674 quartos of *Macbeth*, which Mr. Nicoll also introduces in support of his theory, will appear in another article shortly forthcoming in the *Publications of the Modern Language Association of America*.

I should like to make one other observation on Mr. Nicoll's interesting article. What evidence has he that "D'Avenant . . . seems to have regarded his men as the descendants of that 'young company of players' of whom he had been created governor in the year 1640"? William Beeston, from whom, as Mr. Nicoll points out, D'Avenant was naturally obliged to lease the Salisbury Court theatre (since there was no one else he could have leased it from) "when he started acting there" (*i.e.* at the Salisbury Court theatre), had, it is true, been in charge of D'Avenant's pre-Wars company before D'Avenant acquired it. But of what significance are these facts when we recall that months before they opened at Salisbury Court the nucleus of D'Avenant's Restoration troupe was playing at the Cockpit in Drury Lane, and playing there not under D'Avenant, but under the bookseller John Rhodes? * There the drama reared its drooping head, long before August, when D'Avenant secured his patent, under in fact the dispensation of General Monk, before ever Charles crossed the threshold of Whitehall. Mr. Nicoll may have evidence which he has not adduced, but I have as yet seen no reason why Thomas Betterton and his colleagues should be considered, or indeed to suppose that they ever were considered, either the residuary legatees or the spiritual heirs of D'Avenant's pre-Wars troupe.

It seems unnecessary to go back to "some vague sense of proprietary ownership" of the Elizabethan plays which D'Avenant and Killigrew so cavalierly divided. Into their hands the patents of August 1660 put a monopoly of dramatic performances in London. This monopoly was threatened, but never really injured, by the claims of George Jolly.† The two patentees were obliged either to divide the available stock of drama or else to risk even more

* See John Downes, *Roscius Anglicanus*, ed. Knight, pp. 17-18.

† See J. L. Hotson, "George Jolly, Actor-Manager. New Light on the Restoration Stage," *Studies in Philol.*, xx, 422-443.

direct and disastrous competition than they actually indulged in, which was real enough as all the early annalists assure us.

Mr. Nicoll puts his own finger on the weak point in his argument when he admits * that while many of the plays allocated to D'Avenant were old Cockpit plays, others were "some of the most popular pieces of the King's men themselves," *Hamlet*, for instance. He accounts for this breach in his circumvallation by reverting to his belief (which he had already advanced in his *Dryden as an Adapter of Shakespeare*) that the existence of lost quartos and prompt copies enabled D'Avenant to acquire these plays.

As I have tried to show, this view has no substantial basis.

HAZELTON SPENCER.

[The above note has been submitted in proof to Professor Allardyce Nicoll, who writes as follows :]

My thanks are due to Professor Hazleton Spencer for his note on my article regarding the possible rights of Beeston and D'Avenant in early seventeenth-century plays. It is certainly true, and I emphasised the fact in my article, that the theory put forward is nothing but a theory, devised to explain what appeared to be peculiar facts in Restoration stage history. The records prove definitely one point, that the King's men of post-Restoration days thought themselves entitled to the use of the plays formerly acted at Blackfriars, and consequently in the possession of the old King's men. There is also sufficient justification in the records for the assumption that there was almost as close a connection between Beeston's boys of 1640 and the Duke's players of 1662. It may be that my theory concerning prompt-books is not the correct solution of the difficulty, but the problem remains whether the post-Restoration quartos of Shakespeare were based on preceding quartos or not. Why was D'Avenant granted certain of the most important of Shakespeare's plays in 1661? We have no record of any protest made by the King's players, and D'Avenant must have had some basis for his claim. The changes made in the post-Restoration quartos do not seem to me to date invariably after 1660, and I still believe, although I fully recognise that I may be wrong, that whether in the form of playhouse manuscript or in that of revised quarto D'Avenant's claim was founded on the possession by him or by Beeston of prompt copies of those plays.

ALLARDYCE NICOLL.

* *Review of English Studies*, i. 89.

STAGES AND STAGE SCENERY IN COURT DRAMA
BEFORE 1558

SIR EDMUND CHAMBERS, in chapter xix. of his *Elizabethan Stage*, argues that court plays and interludes before Elizabeth's accession were acted without a raised stage and with very simple settings. "My inference is," he says,* "that the setting of the interludes was nothing but the hall in which the performances were given, with for properties the plenishing of that hall or such movables as could be readily carried in." In support of this view he cites the references to players jostling the audience, borrowing stools, etc., and the general vagueness of place in these early entertainments. On the other hand, he admits that *Wit and Wisdom* requires a number of doors and windows and a den with "craggie cliffs"; that in *Thersites* Mulciber "must have a shop made in the place," and Mater "goeth in the place which is prepared for her"; and that Melissa in *Misogonus* must have a "bowre." † *Gammer Gurton's Needle*, *Roister Doister*, and *Jack Juggler* he believes "do not, so far as setting is concerned, diverge markedly from the interlude type." ‡ He finally admits the use of a raised stage in 1562, when the directions for *Gorboduc* obviously require one and mention it by name.

The result of this assemblage of evidence is that, owing to the scrupulous inclusion of matter supporting both sides, the reader is somewhat at a loss as to whether he shall accept the conclusion as stated at the beginning. I shall attempt in this article to introduce some additional evidence which leads me to believe that the setting and staging of these plays were more elaborate than the author supposes.

In the first place, let us consider the stage itself. It is true that we cannot actually prove its use at court before 1562, but other evidence is not lacking. Sir Edmund Chambers himself in *The Medieval Stage* § quotes Bale's statement that Radclif had used in 1538 at his school at Hitchin "potissimum vero theatrum, quod in inferiori aedium parte longe pulcherrimum extruxit." Again, Professor G. C. Moore Smith, in his *College Plays performed in Cambridge*, gives five entries from college accounts previous to 1550

* *Eliz. Stage*, iii. 23.

† *Ibid.* iii. 27.

‡ *Ibid.* iii. 24.

§ *Medieval Stage*, ii. 197, n.

specifying payments for "ornamenta ædium," "erigendis domibus," "pro erectione cœli," and for steps to a stage. He also tells us that in 1546 the *Pax* of Aristophanes was produced at Trinity College "with the performance of the Scarabæus, his flying up to Jupiter's palace with a man and his basket of victuals on his back," which must have required considerable stage apparatus. And Roger Ascham in an epistle of 1550 * speaks of the "theatrical apparatus for acting plays" at St. John's Hall, Cambridge. Two of these references, it will be noticed, give us absolute authority for the use of a stage prior to 1550, and the others may be said practically to imply the existence of one. † In addition to these facts, we know that stages were used in Italy as early as 1502, ‡ and that Henry VIII.'s court was filled with Italian architects and engineers. Also, both Sir Edmund Chambers and Miss Campbell refer to Serlio's treatise on scenography (in the second volume of his *Architettura*) published in Paris in 1545, in which he gives detailed directions for building stages and setting up scenery.

As to the scenery itself we are on even surer ground. Serlio tells us that the stage should be equipped with houses ("casamenti") suitable to the type of play. These houses, he explains, are not mere paintings but solid structures so that men can see out of them on both sides, and he illustrates this in his diagrams. With a book of this kind appearing across the Channel in 1545 we should imagine that up-to-date stage managers in England would not delay in utilizing its material, if, in fact, they were not already doing so. The references we have quoted to "ornamenta ædium" and "erigendis domibus" and to the hall of St. John's show that this was so in the universities. If these colleges, with limited resources, could put on settings of this sort it seems incredible that Henry, spending huge sums on entertainments, and with a court full of Italians, should have been satisfied with plays produced on the unadorned floor of a hall. That stages and settings were used in the universities before 1550 I have definitely established, and it seems to me extremely unlikely that the universities would be ahead of the court in such expensive methods of production.

LEICESTER BRADNER.

* *Whole Works of Roger Ascham*, ii. 212.

† See also F. S. Boas, *The University Drama in the Tudor Age*, p. 23.

‡ L. B. Campbell, *Scenes and Machines on the Renaissance Stage*, p. 48.

THE "LAW OF RE-ENTRY" IN SHAKESPEARE

IN his article on *The Tempest* in the April *Review of English Studies*, Sir Edmund Chambers refers to the phenomenon, pointed out by Professor Dover Wilson, of Act v. being opened by the same persons who left the stage at the close of the previous scene; and suggests that Professor Wilson has over-emphasised the abnormality of this.

The similar incident quoted from *A Midsummer Night's Dream* hardly seems to be a true parallel, for (a) the persons who concluded III. ii., though (except Puck) they apparently are on the stage at the beginning of IV. i., do not speak the first words of that scene, as Prospero does in *The Tempest*, v. i.; indeed, it is some time before they even awake; (b) if any stage-action is indicated by the Folio stage-direction "They sleepe all the Act", it is obvious that this indicates, not an "exeunt" and immediate re-entry, as in *The Tempest*, but merely a pause in the action during which the actors remained in sight of the audience: and though there is no similar direction in *Qq.*, it is clear from the direction at 144, "they all start up," that the action is as laid down in *F.* In fact, there was here no true "clear stage," and this absolutely distinguishes the two instances.

This immediate re-entry, as of Prospero, appears to occur 36 times in Shakespeare, besides the two already quoted. It should be added that in modern texts other examples can be found, owing to misdivision of scenes where there is no "clear stage"; for instance, *Measure for Measure*, III. i.-ii.; *Julius Caesar*, IV. ii.-iii.; 2 *Henry IV.*, IV. i.-ii., iv.-v.; *Romeo and Juliet*, IV. iv.-v. Of the 36 instances, 24 occur in battle-scenes, and the exit and re-entrance are generally divided by "alarums and excursions"; when the direction is for "alarums" only, or even when both are absent, it is perhaps not too much to assume that in battle-scenes supers would commonly be employed for "excursions," and their appearance would effectually divide the exit and re-entrance of the speaking characters.

Of the remaining 12, it will be found that nearly all are open to suspicion. Two appear only in versions of inferior stage-authenticity, viz. (a) *Hamlet* (Q2), the Queen's entrance in IV. i., where the Folio continues the scene in the Queen's closet, avoiding the "clear stage"; (b) *Titus Andronicus*, IV. i., which is opened by

the persons who closed III. ii. ; but III. ii. (which is entirely superfluous to the action) is absent in *Q.*, and III. i., in which the same persons also appear, is closed by a soliloquy of Lucius, the only character who does not re-appear in IV. i.

In three scenes "exits" in the middle of the scene, of persons who are to begin the next, have probably dropped out: namely, of Speed in *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, II. iv. ; of Apemantus in *Timon*, I. i. ; and of Flaminio in *Timon*, II. ii. One entrance has been added where it is superfluous and probably incorrect: that of Flavius and Marullus—who take no part in the scene—in *Julius Caesar*, I. ii. One "exeunt" has been added to the Folio's direction by modern editors, at the end of *Cymbeline*, v. iii. ; as the "exeunt" is absent, it is doubtful if the Folio is even right in assuming a clear stage and new scene here; the scene-divisions of *Cymbeline* are notoriously inaccurate (e.g. the dubious scene-division at the end of "Actus Primus Scœna Prima" and the absence of one before Posthumus' soliloquy in II. v.).

In *The Taming of the Shrew*, v. ii., Petruchio and Katharina, who closed v. i., may be on the stage at the beginning of the scene; but the direction for their entrance is absent, so it is possible, perhaps probable, that they do not enter until they are addressed at I. 6. In *Richard III.*, III. iv. (*F.*), Ratcliff has a direction for immediate re-entrance at the beginning of the scene, though he takes no part in it till much later. Ratcliff is a suspicious character; owing to earlier revisions of the play he is constantly being confused with Catesby—note the divergence of *Q.* and *F.* over these two characters at IV. iii. 44, the misprint of Catesby's name at IV. iv. 445. In the Quarto version of III. v., the attempt of Catesby to take on both parts has almost produced chaos. It is Catesby, in *Q.*, who is entrusted with the summary execution of Hastings in III. iv., and brings his head in III. v. ; thus in *Q.* Ratcliff, who in both *Q.* and *F.* performs the execution at Pomfret in III. iii., does not re-appear in the next scene at all. Since, in Sc. v. (*Q.*), Catesby is addressed some time before he enters, it is more than doubtful if *Q.* represents the authentic acting version; but the confusion is at least sufficient to throw doubt on Ratcliff's movements in this passage.

In the three remaining scenes—3 *Henry VI.*, v. vii., Gloster's entrance; *Taming of the Shrew*, Induction, Sc. II., Lord's; *All's Well*, v. iii., Lafew's—there is nothing definitely suspicious. But in none of the three scenes does the named character speak the

first words, as Prospero does ; in the first two we have a change from upper- to main-stage or *vice versa*, which would involve a stage wait if the actor were to re-enter before anything else happened ; and in each of these two the character named is not the central figure of a large crowd, so it is most probable that he entered, like Apemantus in *Timon*, i. ii., after they had entered and disposed themselves. In *All's Well*, v. iii., it seems likely that the King and train "enter to" Lafeu—note his words in Sc. ii., "the King's coming," and compare the entry of the Court in *Hamlet*, v. ii.—and that there is no "clear stage." Moreover, the exits and entrances here are defective ; none of the characters has an exit in Sc. ii., so it cannot be definitely stated that Lafeu leaves the stage ; and in Sc. iii., Parolles has a misplaced entrance at l. 158 (besides his correct one at 232), so it is possible that Lafeu's entrance at the beginning is also premature.

It seems, therefore, that the phenomenon in *The Tempest* is indeed exceptional. This opinion is reinforced by the numerous scenes in which the convention is carefully maintained. Note, for example, how gradually the characters are moved from Achilles' tent to Calchas'—first Diomed, then Ulysses and Troilus, then Thersites—so that the exit and re-entrance of each party are carefully divided ; and compare the unexplained and undramatic exit of John of Gaunt in *Richard II.*, i. i., before the end of the scene—for which no reason seems adequate save that he is to open Sc. ii. In his best days Shakespeare maintains the convention even in battle-scenes—e.g. *Coriolanus*, i. v.

Whether he had "any conscious practice in the matter," as Sir Edmund Chambers doubts, is perhaps indiscoverable. It is clear that the convention would be, if not necessary, at least highly desirable on the Elizabethan stage ; for there the clearing of the stage was the only means of indicating that that incident, at that time and place (in other words, that scene), was closed. But if the characters go out and immediately re-enter to begin a new scene, a sense of artificiality would be unavoidable ; as if the actor, on returning, should inform the audience that two hours had elapsed since they last saw him ; and this, indeed, is practically what Prospero does in his first words. It is difficult to believe that this isolated instance accurately represents Shakespeare's method.

C. M. HAINES.

A COLLIER MYSTIFICATION

THE volume classed as MS. Egerton 2623 in the British Museum contains a collection of papers, relating for the most part to the English drama, formed by John Payne Collier. From him it passed probably direct to Frederic Ouvry, whose book-plate it bears and in whose hands it is known to have been in 1879. Ouvry died two years later and his library was dispersed at Sotheby's, 30 March-5 April 1882, the volume in question (lot 530) falling to Ellis at £61. Ellis's stock was sold, also at Sotheby's, 16-28 November 1885, and on this occasion the volume (lot 1189) was bought for £31 by Quaritch on behalf of the Museum, the purchase being made out of the Farnborough fund.

The different items of the collection are described in notes in Collier's hand, which would seem to have been made towards the end of his life, since the writing is rather shaky. One of these, preceding fols. 15-18, runs as follows :

1591

Gorge Peele

Two Manuscripts ; the first of which [fols. 15, 16] the Rev^d A Dyce states is in the hand-writing of George Peele (See Peele's Works III p 161) and one [leaf] of which when Mr Dyce had the MS, was subscribed "Finis G. P", though the signature is now wanting, & worn away, the whole being fragmentary. It was delivered before the Queen in 1591.

The second MS [fols. 17, 18] is headed "The Gardner[?]", but [is] in a different hand & includes some verses : it is also attributed to Peele by Mr Dyce (III. 165) It is indorsed

"A Speeche made before the Queene
at Tybbolles."

Probably delivered on the same occasion

The note is carelessly worded, and indeed somewhat misleading without the supplements made to it above, but it is clear that the authority of Dyce is cited for the first document being autograph and signed with Peele's initials, and also that the second document is stated (quite correctly) to be in a different writing from the first. (As it stands the note might mean that the heading was in a different hand from the text, but this is clearly not the case.)

If we now turn to the third volume of Dyce's edition of Peele,

issued in 1839 as a supplement to the two that formed the original work (1828, reprinted 1829), we may or may not be surprised to find that it in no way bears out Collier's statement. The poem, headed *The Hermit's Speech*, is there right enough on the page indicated, and it is preceded by a description making the alleged assertions, but this is merely a quotation from Collier's own *History of English Dramatic Poetry* (i. 283-4), where the document had been printed *in extenso* in 1831. The statement that "The whole piece is in the poet's handwriting, and his initials, G. P., are subscribed at the end", is not Dyce's at all, but Collier's.

The second document in question, containing *The Gardner's Speech* and *The Molecatcher's Speech*, was in fact first printed by Dyce in 1839. He prefaced it with the note: "The second and third Speeches, forming part of the entertainment to her Majesty on the same occasion, are now printed from a MS. in Peele's handwriting, which has been obligingly lent to me by Mr Collier, who was not possessed of it when he gave his excellent *History* to the public." Since nobody could possibly suppose the two documents to be in the same hand, and since Dyce's text of the first faithfully reproduces certain misreadings of Collier's, we may safely conclude that Dyce had never seen this original of *The Hermit's Speech* at all, and we may further suspect that the opinion that the second was "in Peele's handwriting" had also been "obligingly" communicated to him by Mr. Collier. It is certainly erroneous.

The official catalogue of the Egerton accessions in the British Museum, after quoting Collier's assertion that the first document was in Peele's autograph and once had his initials subscribed, adds: "The first statement is clearly incorrect; and the initials have now been torn away, probably because they were a modern forgery not able to bear examination." On a careful scrutiny I agree that it is improbable that the writing is Peele's, but the question is by no means a simple one, and I cannot feel quite the same confidence as the official cataloguer in answering it. As to the subscription, "Finis. G. P.", having been deliberately torn away, there is I think no doubt possible. At the point where it should stand a strip of paper has clearly been removed, and it is significant that, whereas the tear has taken with it the beginnings of four lines of the text, there is no indication in Collier's print that these lines were at that time defective.

It will be seen that there was good reason for Collier's endeavour

to make Dyce a witness to the autography of the document and the authenticity of the signature. It is curious, however, to observe that when Collier published the second edition of his "excellent *History*" in 1879 (i. 276), he added to the description of The Hermit's Speech the sentence: "It was unknown to Dyce when he published his edition of Peele's Works, and it is now in the library of Frederic Ouvry, Esq., late President of the Society of Antiquaries." Nothing is said of the disappearance of the subscription.

It only remains to observe that apart from minor inaccuracies and aberrations (such as in l. 56 "Magestie" for "Ma^{ti}", and l. 80 "wrett" for "wrytt") Collier's print of the first document is on the whole tolerably faithful. I note the following points: l. 9 "a furlonge" read "3 furlonnges", l. 54 "vanyst was agen" read "vanyshst & was gon" (miswritten "gen"); also the following readings are now mutilated: l. 42 "[tr]aunce", l. 103 "[And] for", l. 104 "[That g]od", l. 105 "[And th]at", l. 106 "[May] roon". Dyce's texts are, of course, modernized.

W. W. GREG.

CHARLES BEST

MR. A. H. BULLEN, in his account of Charles Best in the *D.N.B.*, enumerates Best's contributions to Francis Davison's *Poetical Rhapsodie* of 1602 and his further contributions to the third edition of 1611, and adds "Best's name is only known in connection with the *Poetical Rhapsodie*." In his edition of the *Poetical Rhapsodie* Mr. Bullen added a little to Best's achievements. "He has verses before Robert Pricket's *Honour's fame in triumph riding: or, the life and death of the late Honble Earl of Essex*, 1604, and Sir William Leighton's *Tears or Lamentations of a sorrowfull soul*, 1614. Joseph Hunter ascribes to him *The ghost of Richard III.*, 1614, which probably belongs to Christopher Rooke. John Davies of Hereford addressed an epigram to "my kind friend, Mr. Charles Best" (among the epigrams to worthy persons) in *The Scourge of Folly*, 1610-11. For directing my attention to these accounts I am indebted to Mr. Lionel Gough of the Queen's College, Oxford.

The data given by Mr. Bullen yield us more information about Best than he has elicited from them. Davies' epigram, "To my kind friende Mr. Charles Best" implies that Best was a lawyer:

Charles thou hast law and thou hast Conscience too
 So dost in conscience what some others do
 That thrive not by it : but, be rul'd by me ;
 Let law and Conscience now so bee in thee
 That thou maist live by lawe, in lawfull wise . . .

and Best's lines "To my right worthy, Worshipfull and learned cosen, Sir William Leighton knight" are signed "Car. Best de med. Temp. Arm."

Turning now to the *Middle Temple Records* (vol. i. p. 327), we find among the admissions, under date April 22, 1592 :

"Mr. Charles, son and heir apparent of John Best of Codridge, Worcestershire, gent. . . . Bound with Messrs Andrew and Richard Blunden."

Frequent references follow.

On 23 Jan. 1595 Basil Brooke is bound with Mess^{rs}. Andrew Blunden and Charles Best, on 31 May 1600 Francis Keat with the same, on 20 Oct. 1600 Richard, son and heir of Humfrey Blunden of Librynorth, Shrops., with the same, on 29 Oct. 1600 John Delamere with Mess^{rs}. Charles Beast and Richard Blunden jun., on 3 Nov. 1600 Richard Lybbe with Mess^{rs}. Andrew Blunden and Charles Best, on 22 May 1601 Ellis, second son of Charles Walcott of Walcott, Shrops., with the same, on 30 Oct. 1601 among the Utter Barristers fined 20/- for absence from M^r. Walrond's reading are "Jo. Hoskyns. . Rudyerd. . Best," on 29 Oct. 1602 and 3 June 1603 among the Utter Barristers fined 20/- for absence from readings are the same three names as before, on 12 Feb. 1604 Humfrey Lowe was bound with Mess^{rs}. Charles Best and Ellis Walcott, on 28 Jan. 1609 "M^r. Charles Best to the chamber of Mess^{rs}. Rich. Blunden jun. and Edw. Popham on forfeiture by the latter," on 22 May 1612 "M^r. Thos. Gwynn to the chamber of Mess^{rs}. Charles Best and Rich. Blunden on death of the latter," on 6 Nov. 1613 Martin Wollascott bound with Mess^{rs}. Charles Best and Humfrey Walcott, and on the 8th the same admitted to the chamber of M^r. Charles Best, a Master of the Utter Bar and M^r. Thos. Gwynn, on surrender by latter, on 30 Oct. 1618 among those fined £10 for not reading—"Best," on 26 May 1620 Francis Baker bound with his father and Charles Beste esq., on 13 Feb. 1621 "M^r. Edm. Hawles to the chamber of M^r. Charles Best, one of the most ancient masters of the Utter Bar, and M^r. Martin Wollascott on surrender by the latter," on 28 Nov. 1623 John, son and heir apparent of Charles Walcott of Finsburie, Middlesex, bound with his father and Charles Best, esq., and also admitted to the chamber of M^r. Charles Best, one of the most ancient Masters of the Utter Bar, and M^r. Edm. Hawles on surrender by the latter, on 21 April 1627 M^r. Richard Phillips bound with Charles Best esq. and John Walcott gent.

We have learnt that this busy lawyer was the son and heir of John Best of Codridge, or Cotheridge, Worcestershire.

In the list of *Worcester Wills* we find (vol. i. p. 206) under the year 1567, No. 82c, the marriage bond of "Beste, John, Codriche" and "Walcot, Margaret, Codriche;" and p. 362, under 1594, No. 26, the will of "John Best, the dale, Cotheridge" (also 1595, No. 10).

We see, then, that the Ellis Walcott and John Walcott (sons of Charles W.) were probably Best's kinsmen. Edward Best, B.A., Peterhouse, 160 $\frac{2}{3}$ and rector of Elmley Lovett, co. Worcester, 1620-166 $\frac{2}{3}$, was possibly Charles' brother.*

As to Best's contributions to the *Poetical Rhapsody*, Mr. Bullen praises the Sonnets to the Sun and to the Moon as graceful pieces, but says that his additions to the *P.R.* (3rd edition) are "very inferior and might well have been spared."

It is worth noting, however, that the first stanza of *A Panegyrick* has reminiscences of Gaunt's speech in *Richard II.* (II. 1. 40, etc.); and there is interest in Best's translations in the original metres of the Latin lines from J. de Garlandia's *De contentu mundi* ("The poor man beloved, for virtue approved, right blessed is he") and of a set of rimed Latin hexameters ("But love omnipotent, all things by his word who created").

G. C. MOORE SMITH.

TWO POEMS ATTRIBUTED TO PRIOR

MR. A. R. WALLER printed in the Appendix to his edition of Prior (ii. 380-4, 408) two poems attributed by some editors to Prior, by others to Swift. Both relate to the fall of Marlborough, so it is necessary to begin by stating the facts referred to. On December 21, 1711, the Commissioners for Examining and Stating the Public Accounts presented a Report to the House of Commons accusing Marlborough of embezzlement, and on the following day put in the Deposition of Sir Solomon Medina which was their chief piece of evidence against him. The Duke answered by printing in the *Daily Courant* for December 27, a letter in vindication of himself which he had sent to the Commissioners about six weeks earlier. In reply the Commissioners published their Report at length on December 29. On December 30 the Queen declared in council "That being informed an information against the Duke of Marl-

* See pedigree of his descendants in *Miscell. Gen. et Her.*, New Ser. iv. 234.

borough was laid before the House of Commons by the Commissioners of the Public Accounts, she thought fit to dismiss him from all his employments, that the matter might take an impartial examination." The next day she notified his dismissal to the Duke by a letter under her own hand (Boyer, *Political State*, vol. ii. pp. 464-80; *Parliamentary History*, vi. 1049-1059, 1076). The poem entitled "A Fable of a Widow and Her Cat" appeared a few days later. The original is a half-sheet folio, "printed for John Morphew, near Stationers-Hall, 1712." A widow, it says, kept a favourite cat, who at first did good service against rats and mice, but afterwards conspired with the Fox to rob his mistress, stole her chickens and cream, and was justly handed over to the watch-dog for punishment. The widow meant Queen Anne, the Cat Marlborough, the Fox Godolphin, the Watch-Dog Parliament. Boyer reprinted the poem in the *Political State of Great Britain* for January 1711-2, as a specimen of the attacks on Marlborough. He said: "One of the writers of the *Examiner*, who had constantly pursued the Duke with merciless fury and profligate malice, did on this occasion publish the following Fable of the Widow and her Cat" (vol. iii. p. 3). These words pointed to Swift, and this attribution seems to have been generally accepted.

However, the real authorship of the Fable is settled by a passage in the *Journal to Stella*. Under January 4, Swift says: "I was in the City to-day, and dined with my printer, and gave him a ballad made by several hands, I know not whom. I believe Lord-Treasurer had a finger in it. I added three stanzas; I suppose Dr. Arbuthnot had the greatest share." The printer in question was John Morphew, who had just produced the *Conduct of the Allies*. The Fable which he now printed, contained nine verses; the fourth, which is a very bad one, may very well have been by Harley, the last three are not unlike Swift in style and ideas.

Swift did not regard this trifle as a serious attack on Marlborough. At the moment he was inclined to spare the Duke. "Now he is down," he wrote to Stella on January 8, "I shall not trample on him; although I love him not, I dislike his being out." But mercy was conditional on the submission of the Duke and his friends. "The Ministers' design is, that the Duke of Marlborough shall be censured as gently as possible, provided his friends will not make head to defend him" (January 23).

But they did defend him both in prose and verse. Under

January 31 Swift observes: "A poem is come out to-day, inscribed to me by way of a flirt; for it is a Whiggish poem, and good for nothing. They plagued me with it in the Court of Requests." The poem was entitled "When the Cat's away, the Mice may play. A Fable, humbly inscribed to Dr. Sw—t." It fills a folio sheet, is undated, and was printed for A. Baldwin, Warwick Lane." The Widow, it tells us, had discarded the Cat, owing to the intrigues of Mrs. Abigail, her waiting maid, who wanted the favourite's position for her lap-dog. Everything went wrong in the household in consequence of the change, so the widow resolved to take her Cat back again. The parable was plainly directed against Mrs. Masham and Harley.

It is absurd to attribute to Prior a poem written against the party of which he was a member and the policy which he was employed to carry out. Possibly it was one of the "little pieces" written by Arthur Maynwaring, which Oldmixon mentions in the *Life and Posthumous Works* of that Whig worthy, though he does not give their titles (p. 339). The laudatory reference to the Duchess of Marlborough in the sixteenth verse suggests Maynwaring's hand.

The result of the "flirt" at Swift in the title, and of the persistency with which Marlborough's friends defended the Duke, was to rouse Swift to action. He forgot his resolve not to trample on Marlborough, and published on February 14, 1712, the scathing satire entitled *The Fable of Midas*.

C. H. FIRTH.

JOHNSON AND THE LONGITUDE

It is well known that one of the many literary performances of Johnson, the motive to which was philanthropy, was a treatise on the Longitude. Zachariah Williams, the father of blind Anna Williams, died in 1755, being then eighty-two years old. In that year was published by Dodsley *An Account of an Attempt to Ascertain the Longitude at Sea. . . . By Zachariah Williams*. This was written by Johnson; and the Italian translation printed *en face* was made by Baretti (Boswell, ed. Hill, i. 274, 301; Courtney, *Bibliography of Johnson*, 72).

It does not seem to have been recently * noticed that a series of

* The letters are mentioned by Nichols in a footnote to his account of the Williamses, *Lit. Anecd.* ii. 180. Nothing is there said of the authorship—*sed vide infra*.

letters, stated to have been written or revised by Johnson for Williams, is printed in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1787. (It is not indexed *s.v.* Johnson.) The contributor was M. Green, who sent to the July number (p. 557) "a paper which came into my hands among many others, by purchase, soon after the death of Mrs. Anna Williams." She had left her property to "the Ladies School" of the parish of St. Sepulchre; and her books and some MSS. were sold. Green submits one of these, *Thoughts on the Soul*, which he claims to have been "formed in the Johnsonian school"; and adds that "should this be deemed worthy insertion, it shall be followed by several letters, humanely written, by Dr. Johnson, for the service of Mrs. Williams's father; * the authenticity of which will not depend on vague conjecture."

The letters follow accordingly in September (p. 757) and December (p. 1041); they are without preamble or signature—a fact which surprised me till I found the earlier note. It is clear from that note that Green bought the letters (which were presumably copies of the originals, made at the time) at Miss Williams's sale. There is, however, a heading, in which the attribution to Johnson is modified; the letters are offered as *Original Letters of Zachary Williams; Some of them corrected, and others written, by Dr. Samuel Johnson*. They are addressed to Lord Halifax, Lord Anson, the Lords of the Admiralty, and others; and are all petitions for the favourable consideration of the "secret as yet unknown to the learned world," of which Williams believed himself the discoverer. There are also letters from the Admiralty Office and from John Bradley,† who was called in as an expert. His unfavourable report concludes the series. (I am informed that, with insignificant exceptions, no letters from private persons addressed to the Admiralty before 1801 have been preserved in the Public Record Office.)

Thus the external evidence is strong. The provenance of the MSS. is clear; the editor of the *Magazine*, who was a shrewd judge and probably knew something of the matter, accepts the attribution. Murphy indeed, in his Essay on Johnson (in *Johnsonian Miscellanies*, i. 401), states that the MSS. were "still extant in the hands of Mr. Nichols."

* Boswell did not know that Zachariah was the father of Anna, though he "presumed she was a relation."

† *Sic* the G.M.; but Murphy (*loc. cit.*, *infra*) calls him "the celebrated professor of Astronomy." This was James Bradley, Savilian Professor and Astronomer Royal.

When we turn to the letters themselves, it is at once apparent that they were not all written by Johnson. The first begins thus :

MY LORD,

Permit an old man, in the 82nd year of his age, one who has long been the sport of fortune, to address your Lordship.

On the other hand, the letters contain passages which, if they were not written by Johnson, were written by a sedulous ape of no common ability. They are eminently Johnsonian both in sentiment and in diction. Take this from p. 1041 :

MY LORDS,

As my proposal for settling the variation has had the honour to attract the notice of your Lordships, and to be referred to the Professor of Astronomy, I presume to intreat one more act of indulgence ; which I flatter myself that your Lordship's known skill in philosophy and navigation, and that curiosity which science always produces, will incline you to grant.

I have, by the industry of many years, prepared an instrument, which may be called an epitome or miniature of the terraqueous globe. It shows the variation of the variations for two hundred years, and consequently resolves by inspection, without any calculus or table, all questions relating to the sailor's needle. If the year for which the variation is required, with the longitude and latitude of the place, be given me, I can immediately show the variation ; if the year, latitude, and variation be given, I can show the longitude. As I am conscious to myself of no fraud, I would not decline the severest trial before men who know to how much uncertainty the utmost accuracy which experiment and observation have yet attained is exposed, and who can make the just allowances for the slowness and hesitation of a man now sunk with disappointments, and overborn with more than eighty years. I, therefore, humbly petition for the privilege of exhibiting before your Lordships the effects of my instrument, and intreat that such questions may be prepared as shall seem to your Lordships sufficient for a trial.

R. W. CHAPMAN.

BROOKE'S *GUSTAVUS VASA*

THIS play, which was refused a licence at about the same time as Thomson's *Edward and Eleonora*, is now remembered, if at all, as the occasion of Johnson's satirical pamphlet *A Compleat Vindication of the Licensers of the Stage*. The play was published by Dodsley :

Gustavas Vasa, the Deliverer of his Country. A Tragedy. As it was to have been acted at the Theatre-Royal in Drury-Lane. By Henry Brooke, Esq; London: Printed for R. Dodsley, at Tully's Head Pall-Mall. MDCCXXXIX.

Johnson says (Hill's Boswell, i. 141) that Brooke was "recompensed by a very liberal subscription." Courtney stated (*Bibliography of Johnson*, p. 10) that the subscribers' names are not given. But Courtney had not seen a subscriber's copy. These, which are I think printed on thicker paper, seem to differ from ordinary copies: (1) by omitting the price (1s. 6d.) from the foot of the title-page; (2) by adding, after the *Prefatory Dedication to the Subscribers*, a twelve-page *List of the Subscribers*. This statement rests on inspection of my own copies (one of each) and on reports of copies in the British Museum, the Bodleian, and Worcester College. The Bodleian copy has neither price nor subscribers—perhaps it has lost them.

The list, which is imposing—it had, no doubt, the force of a political demonstration—contains some notable names; among them:

Lord Chesterfield, ten guineas;

Mr. Samuel Johnson;

Earl of Marchmont, four books;

The Very Rev. Dr. Jonathan Swift, ten books.

R. W. C.

PATENT FOR PARIS GARDEN IN 1547

IN the recently published Calendar of Patent Rolls of Edward VI. (1547-1548) there is a Licence to William Baselly (or Baseley), gent., "to keep open within the King's manor of Parisse Garden, Surrey, the games of boules or bowlinge, Cardes, dyze, and tables for the recreation of all town subjects and honest persons, almanner apprentices, vacabundes, and common barreeterers only excepted"; and licence to the King's subjects "except before exceptyd," to play the said games "notwithstanding the statutes of 18 Edw. IV. or 32 Hen. VIII."—"By Privy Seal, dated Greenwich, 18 April, 1547."

W. H. GRATTAN FLOOD.

WHITEHALL IN 1642

THOSE who are interested in the Court Masques of Charles I., and to whom the tract, which I believe to be of some rarity, is unknown, may like to see the following picturesque extracts from *A Deep Sigh Breath'd Through The Lodgings At White-Hall, Deploing the absence of the Court, And the Miseries of the Pallace.* 4to. 1642.

To begin at the entrance into the Court, where there had wont to be a continuall throng, either of Gallants standing to ravish themselves with the sight of Ladies hansome Legs and Insteps as they tooke Coach ; Or of the tribe of guarded Liveries, by whom you could scarce passe without a jeare or a saucy answer to your question ; now if you would aske a question there is no body to make answer, no nor to stop a pursuing Bayly, if you should take that for your Sanctuary. (A 2.)

And when you are in the Hall, for ought I know, you might as well have kept you out on't unlesse you would discourse with Mistres Eccho, or play at Shittle-Cocke by your selfe, for ther's no body to play with you. (A 2 verso.)

In the Cockpit and Revelling Roomes, where at a Play or Masque the darkest night was converted to the brightest Day that ever shin'd, by the luster of Torches, the sparkling of rich Jewells and the variety of those incomparable and excellent Faces, from whence the other derived their brightnesse, where beauty sat inthron'd in so full glory that had not *Phaeton* fir'd the World, there had wanted a Comparative whereunto to paralell the refulgencie of their bright-shining splendor, Now you may goe in without either a Ticket, or the danger of a broken-pate, you may enter at the Kings side, walke round about the Theaters, (*sic*) view the Pullies, the Engines, conveyances or contrivances of every several Scène, And not an Usher o' th' Revells, or Engineere to envy or finde fault with your discovery, although they receive no gratuitie for the sight of them. (A 3 verso.)

G. T.-D.

REVIEWS

Restoring Shakespeare, a Critical Analysis of the Misreadings in Shakespeare's Works, with Facsimiles and Numerous Plates. By LEON KELLNER. (Englische Bibliothek herausgegeben von Max Förster, vierter Band.) Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz (London: George Allen & Unwin, Ltd.). 1925. 8°, pp. xvi.+183+34 plates. [Price 10s. 6d.]

THE last twenty years have witnessed a remarkable advance in Shakespearian criticism; the last ten have seen the foundations laid of a new method in the emendation of his text. There is, of course, nothing novel in the idea that palæography is the basis of textual criticism, but those who formerly approached the problem from this side appear to have turned away again discouraged by a twofold ignorance, of the character of Shakespeare's handwriting and of the relation in which the extant texts stand to the original. Recently, however, the critical position has undergone an important change, and inspired on the one hand by Sir Edward Maunde Thompson's investigations into the probable nature of Shakespeare's script, and on the other by Professor A. W. Pollard's defence of the authority of the textual tradition, Professor Dover Wilson, at once more fortunate and more intrepid than his predecessors, has addressed to the subject the powers of an almost acrobatic brain, and in his introduction to the New Cambridge Shakespeare and his contributions to Professor Pollard's symposium on *Sir Thomas More* and the tenth volume of *Essays and Studies*, has sketched the outlines of a palæographical method in the emendation of Shakespeare's text.

The present work appears, therefore, at an opportune moment. Dr. Leon Kellner, formerly professor of English philology in the K.K. Franz-Josefs-Universität at Czernowitz in Bukovina, has been occupied since 1913 in studying Elizabethan handwriting and applying the knowledge so gained to elucidating difficulties in Shakespeare's text. His book, a comprehensive examination of the

damage which the poet's words may be supposed to have suffered at the hands of scribes and compositors, is an elaborate defence of the thesis that the great source of corruption is the misreading of manuscript "copy" owing to the similarity of certain letters in the current script, and that consequently palæographical analysis is the master-key to emendation. It is the first comprehensive and fully systematic investigation of the subject that has appeared, and the generous provision of facsimiles, beside the rich collection of carefully arranged examples, gives it enhanced importance. It is to be hoped that the book will be closely and patiently studied by all who are interested in the text of Shakespeare and his contemporaries, for they are not likely to meet with a more minute and single-minded treatment of the subject. For the critics of the future it may possibly stand as a landmark in Shakespearian studies; meanwhile we should remember that, as a pioneer, the author is entitled at once to the respect due to achievement in a new field and the indulgence due to such as work under novel conditions.

The appearance of a work of this nature at the present moment is so important, its author's devotion so great, and his exposition so candid, that it is a pity that it cannot be recommended more unreservedly than, to me at least, seems possible. It is a pity not only for its own sake, but because, in repelling readers by exaggerated claims and unattractive results, it may rather discredit than recommend the method it advocates. This would be a disaster. Believing, as I do, in the essential soundness of the palæographical theory, I propose, therefore, to examine at some length what I take to be the defects of the work and the causes of its partial failure, and it will be convenient to group what I have to say under the heads of general method, of palæographical criticism, of the need for emendation, and of individual conjectures.

It seems to me that Dr. Kellner's worst faults are failures of method, and it will be seen in the sequel that these are to some extent more apparent than real, or rather that, unless I have seriously misunderstood him, his theory is much less sound than his practice. My general view is that, while it is not altogether easy to arrive at the exact part which Dr. Kellner supposes the misreading of manuscript forms to play in textual corruption, there can be no doubt that he exaggerates, I will not say the importance of this cause, but at least its extension. It is true that he has some very sensible remarks of a general nature, as when he writes :

The confusion of letters, although the most fruitful source of mistakes, is, however, not the be-all and end-all, of textual criticism, and it has been my endeavour to make use of all the principles that have been applied by scholars to classical texts, and to the Old Testament, with such surprising results. . . . Much as we must try to apply the test of similarity of letters to every word-puzzle . . . we shall never lose sight of the fact that, in workings of the mind, what occurs frequently need not occur always.

And at the end of his book he devotes some thirty pages to such points as the confusion of prefixes and terminations, transposition, substitution, dittography, haplography, etc., in which misreading can play little or no part. But if the reader tends to overlook these evidences and gets the impression that for Dr. Kellner confusion of manuscript forms is the "Open Sesame," as he calls it, of every corruption, the author has largely himself to blame. Perhaps the heading of § 12—"Misprints must be accounted for by the Hand-writing"—misrepresents his real attitude; but there it stands. In any case, we shall hardly be doing Dr. Kellner injustice if we suppose him to regard manuscript misreadings as at least, in his own words, "the most fruitful source of mistakes". Moreover, under the heading (§ 15) "Isolating the Problem", he has given an account of his own method, which I am afraid is essentially correct. After remarking that Shakespearian criticism has to take account of various theories concerning shorthand, dictation, and so forth, he continues :

I have, for my present purpose, carefully avoided these puzzles. I have thought it necessary to isolate my problem (as scientists often do), and to proceed on the supposition that what the printers of the Quartos and of those Folio plays of which no authorised editions had been printed had before them, were transcripts not far removed from the manuscripts written by Shakespeare himself.

I confess that simply to ignore possible alternative explanations seems to me a very queer way of "isolating the problem." Had Dr. Kellner begun by eliminating all instances of error that could reasonably be ascribed to some other cause, and then inquired how far the hypothesis of misreading was adequate to account for the residue, he might reasonably have talked of "isolating the problem" and of proceeding on a scientific method. But he would seem never fully to have thought out the conditions of his investigation, and in fact grounds his argument on two wholly unproved assumptions. One of them, the general authority of the printer's "copy," will certainly be questioned by some critics, though for my part I should

be prepared to grant him pretty much all he wants so far as the "good" texts are concerned. The other—namely, the dogma that after allowing for certain recognised habits of scribes and compositors (including that of calling black white and *vice versa*—§ 207) "Misprints must be accounted for by the Handwriting"—I could only assent to with very large reservations. To my reason for this I shall return.

Though simply ignoring the possibility that shorthand or dictation can have had anything to do with the corruption of the text, Dr. Kellner does discuss and endeavour to disprove one alleged source of error. This is "foul case," namely the presence, in the several compartments of the compositor's cases of type, of letters other than those that properly belong there. He quotes, from *Shakspeare and Typography*, Blades's account of how sorts may be supposed to slip down from one box to another just below it, and adds that this "might account for *b* instead of *l*, *d* instead of *n*, *o* instead of *a*, *g* instead of *q*. But there the matter ends." However, the matter does not by any means end there, for the fact that he was a practical printer did not save Blades from curiously misapprehending the nature of "foul case." No one, I believe, has ever shown that the confusions ascribed by him to this cause are more prevalent than any others. On the other hand, there is no question that many slips occur in the course of distribution, partly perhaps through mechanical error of the hand, but much more through the compositor mistaking a type he picks out of the forme, and that by this means the case becomes "foul." That the frequent interchange of "h" and "b" is due to this cause is suggested by the fact that it is particularly common in italic, where the forms *h* and *b* are almost identical. And if it be objected that italic type often represents Italian script, in which there is a resemblance between the letters, the objector may fairly be asked to explain how it comes that a "nulla" sometimes takes the place of the letter "o," a turned "d" of a "p," a turned "n" of a "u," and so on. I have little doubt that "foul case" is responsible for the majority of those misprints by which a perfectly common word, and one perfectly natural in the context, is turned into an absurdity. If a text has *thcee* instead of *three*, it is illegitimate to cite this as evidence of the resemblance of *r* and *c* in the "copy," because a compositor would be under no temptation to misprint *three* as *thcee*, however much the *r* might (and no doubt often did) resemble a *c*. It is only

where the substitution produces a possible word, still more a superficially plausible reading, or where the transmutation of several letters has rendered the true word unrecognisable, that it is legitimate to suppose that misreading of the "copy" can be the origin of the error.

In arranging his instances, Dr. Kellner's method (a sound one) is to collect under each literal confusion, first (A) instances of the error in which the correction is supplied by a contemporary edition (or, outside Shakespeare, in lists of errata and the like); next (B) "generally received emendations by eminent critics" involving the same; and lastly (C) his own conjectures based thereon. Thus the foundation of the structure is the collection of supposedly certain corrections given in class A, and its validity depends on how these instances have been collected. We naturally, therefore, turn to Dr. Kellner's own account of his "Mode of Proceeding" (§ 14). From this it would appear that the whole of his Shakespearian material is drawn from a comparison of the "four pirated Quartos"—*Romeo and Juliet*, 1597; *Henry V*, 1600; *The Merry Wives*, 1602; *Hamlet*, 1603—with the corresponding good texts, and of the "divergent copies" of the first quarto of *Lear*; and he adds that since these "supply scant material for documentary evidence" they have been supplemented from non-Shakespearian sources.* On this procedure he writes as follows:

All the misreadings † in the pirated Quartos . . . which are corrected in the authorised editions, I consider as indisputable facts, or so many pieces of evidence of certain individual letters or groups of manuscript letters having been misread. Whether it was the scribe who misread the

* These include the variants of the manuscripts of the Chester Plays, as reported in the E.E.T.S. edition. But although the extant manuscripts of the cycle were written between 1591 and 1607 there is reason to believe that they are all direct copies of very much earlier originals, and it is evident that the misreadings by a scribe c. 1600 of an original of c. 1500, will be of a very different nature from the same scribe's misreadings of a contemporary manuscript. Moreover, Dr. Kellner's citations from this source are sometimes most surprising. On p. 115 we find: "*Ego sum Alpha et [ω] | primus et novissimus* (Chester Plays, p. 9, 1/2). Thus B. Read, with h, *nobilissimus*." Of course, Dr. Kellner's omission of the "ω" has made nonsense of the passage, but apart from this it is obvious that the reading *nobilissimus* (though it is apparently that of H, which is a good manuscript, as well as of h, which is a very bad one) is an error, and *novissimus* (from *Apoc.* xxii. 13) correct. Moreover, it is hardly possible that misreading can have had anything to do with the variant, for the error would seem to have got into H and h independently; clearly *nobilissimus* is a shot by scribes to whom the Vulgate was unfamiliar.

† I suppose bad readings, misprints, are meant, otherwise the sentence has no apparent meaning. If the errors of the "bad" quartos are misreadings, it follows—that they are misreadings!

original, or the compositor who misread the copy, it is impossible to decide. For our purpose it is enough to know that such and such manuscript characters were misread.

Any one familiar with the trend of recent opinion on the subject of pirated texts and its insistence on memory as a factor in the transmission, may well gasp at Dr. Kellner's calm assurance. He proceeds :

When, for instance, the pirated Quarto of "Romeo and Juliet" reads, *From civil broils broke into enmity* (Prologue 3), he certainly set up a gross mistake, as the context shows ; and the authorised "good" Second Quarto, with its version of *mutiny*, i.e. civil war, restores the sense of the line. As there is every evidence for assuming that the "good" Quarto was printed from manuscript,* we are safe in the further assumption that *mutiny* was not an ingenious emendation, but the original reading. It follows, then, that either the copyist or the compositor misread *mutiny* for *enmity* †—a very instructive mistake . . .

But the corruption *enmity* does not stand by itself, and I have not the slightest doubt in my own mind that where, in place of the correct line (Q 2) :

From auncient grudge, breake to new mutinie,

the pirated text (Q 1) reads :

From ciuill broyles broke into enmitie,

it is presenting us, not with any misreading or miswriting of the true version, but with a memorial reconstruction—whether of the actor or the pirate is immaterial. If this is so—and the view is too well supported to be lightly waived aside—the whole of Dr. Kellner's argument as just quoted collapses. And even if this view is mistaken, one may still ask why *enmitie* should be a misreading of *mutinie* any more than *ciuill broyles* of *auncient grudge*—which even Dr. Kellner does not venture to suggest. There is, in fact, not the slightest evidence that any one ever did or ever could misread the letters *mutin* as *enmit*, and any conclusion based on such assumption is left in the air. I suppose this is an instance of "isolating the

* This was long ago questioned, I understand, and there is not a little evidence in favour of the view (to which I personally incline) that the second quarto was in part at least printed from a much-corrected copy of the first. But the point is not immediately important ; no one questions the relative authority of the second compared to the first.

† I presume Dr. Kellner means "misread *mutiny* as *enmity*" !

problem." Does Dr. Kellner really believe that an ignorant scribe and a careless compositor transformed, say, *Hamlet* as we know it in the second quarto into *Hamlet* as it appears in the first? Of course not. But that appears to be the logical inference from his argument.

The fact is that the pirated texts, being those of whose nature we know least, are the very last that should be dragged into a discussion of this kind. And the case is not much better with the variant readings in the first quarto of *Lear*. To illustrate (§ 10) the "Accumulation of Misprints" due to misreading Dr. Kellner cites a passage found in some copies of the first quarto (III. iv. 125-6):

swithald footed thrice the old, a nellthu night more and her nine fold

which is very likely to be interpreted as:

S. Withald footed thrice the 'old, 'a met the night-mare and her nine fole.*

Here it certainly looks as though *nellthu* might be a complex misreading of *mett the*, but this particular variant cannot be considered apart from its ninety-odd fellows. And when we examine the whole list two things quickly become apparent: one, that many of the errors can hardly be ordinary misreadings (e.g. *alapt* is altered to *attaskt for*, and *these—and wast of this his to the wast and spoyle of his*); the other, that many of the so-called corrections are themselves incorrect, and appear to be mere guesses of the press reader. Add to our uncertainty on this score the fact that different critics have taken different views of the relation of the quarto and folio texts of the play, and it must be allowed that, in the present state of our knowledge, no cautious student would rely on data from this source.

Had Dr. Kellner's practice in fact been what he represents in his introductory chapter his book would have been damned at the start. But the curious thing is that the perverse exposition quoted above entirely misrepresents his actual procedure. It is true that examples drawn from the pirated quartos and the variant copies of *Lear* do figure in his class A, and they would be better absent, though the harm done is not great. But the majority of instances are drawn from other plays in which sometimes the folio

* Dr. Kellner has bungled the evidence badly. The form in which he quotes the passage on p. 11 is not that of any copy of the first quarto, but that given in the second; and his "true reading as revealed in the corrected copies" is an invention of his own found in no early edition at all. He quotes the passage again on p. 81, in a different form and again incorrectly.

has a misprint not found in the quarto, sometimes the quarto an error corrected in the folio. There are, it is true, cases in which one could pick holes in the evidence, but broadly the collection may be accepted as containing reliable examples of unquestioned mistakes the correction of which is not open to doubt. And this is what is needed. Where, however, doubt, and grave doubt, does enter in, is when we come to ask whether, or rather how far, these errors are due to a scribe or compositor being misled by the manuscript forms in the "copy" before him. It is true that many are well accounted for on this ground, and the explanation is often tempting; but in other instances it appears a good deal less probable, and unless the possibility of other sources of error can be excluded, it is doubtful whether misreading should be regarded as a prevalent, let alone a universal, cause. Indeed, there are various considerations that should make us hesitate to assume it.

Every modern writer must know that compositors are capable of making blunders for which there is apparently nothing whatever in the "copy" to account. When one printer made me talk about a "morbid picture" when I was trying to describe a "marked failure," he was, I dare say, misled by the *ductus litterarum*; but when another substituted "European" for "Epicurean" philosophy, I think it must have been due to original sin, if not the personal intervention of the Devil (see *Shakespeare and Typography*, p. 71). Again, I have already alluded to the difficulty of ascribing to misreading literal errors resulting in impossible words, and Dr. Kellner's class A is generally, and properly, free from instances of this sort.* But, if this is admitted, it follows that some cause of corruption other than misreading is in operation; and if this other cause (perhaps "foul case") can corrupt *three* into *thcee*, it can presumably also corrupt *ran* into *can*. Moreover, if, in such a case as this, in which the similarity of the letters is admitted, confusion may nevertheless not be due to misreading, it is surely rash to assume that it *must* be due to misreading in cases where the similarity is more remote.†

* Occasionally, however, he falls into the trap. Thus in explanation of the "misreading," in *Lear*, iv. iv. 18, of *desires* (F) for *distresse* (Q) he quotes the *i : t* misprints *io*, *Thai*, *ihe*, *boih*. In so far as these are relevant at all they are evidence rather against than for the error being due to misreading—which, indeed, it hardly can be if Professor Pollard is right in thinking that the folio was printed from the quarto.

† I may be allowed to recall that in analysing a list of three hundred corrections made by Massinger himself in some of his plays, I came to the conclusion that under twenty per cent were clearly the result of graphic confusion (see *The Library*, June 1924, v. 79).

It is a pity that Dr. Kellner did not, and that literary critics in general do not, institute some such investigation as in scientific experiment is called a "control." It can, for instance, easily be shown that types of corruption, essentially similar to those that occur in printing from manuscript, are found equally where manuscript misreading is out of the question. Take, for example, the text of *Love's Labour's Lost* as printed in the 1598 quarto and the first folio. There can be no doubt that the folio is printed from the quarto, which it follows minutely, while the quarto is almost certainly printed from manuscript. (There may have been an earlier edition, but if so it probably contained a pirated text.) Now, if we examine critically the differences between the two texts that seem to be due to misprints in one or other, excluding moreover from the quarto some that are probably eccentric spellings of the "copy,"* and from the folio some errors that may be unintelligent attempts at emendation, we shall find, I believe, that the folio introduces almost exactly the same number of misprints as it corrects—namely just under fifty. This is, in itself, a remarkable result. To the errors of the quarto must, of course, be added an uncertain number of misprints that the folio failed to correct, but even with this allowance it is evident that the field of probable misreadings has been severely restricted. Moreover, the types of the errors corrected and perpetrated by the folio correspond almost exactly. If we classify the misprints we shall find each species represented in quarto and folio alike: literal errors of one letter making an impossible word (Q 13, F 9) or making an existent word (Q 6, F 7); complex literals (Q 3, F 2); transpositions (of letters, Q 2; of words, F 2); omission of letters (Q 11, F 4) and of words (Q 2, F 7); insertion of letters (Q 4, F 13) and of words (Q 1, F 1); and lastly serious corruptions (Q 5, F 6). To take only a few instances, we find *felfe*, *vonuto* (*venuto*), *Coddesse*, *Bojet*, in the folio, parallel to *perhapt*, *indistrell* (*indiscreet*), *Gfficer*, *paqer* in the quarto; *repaie* (*repaide*), *soule* (*foole*),† *ioue* (*loue*), *ears* (*eare*), in the folio, against *visage* (*visag'd*), *shrowde* (*shrewd*), *gift* (*gilt*), *instance* (*instant*), in the quarto; *breake* for *speake* in the folio, and *stable* for *stab'd* in the quarto; the omissions *Russia(n)*,

* The quarto has a beautiful example of haplography in the word *snouchite*, but I have little doubt that it stood so in the manuscript.

† A most instructive pair. If the folio had been set up from manuscript "copy" one would have at once set down the former as the usual *e : d* misreading (whereas the word in the quarto is perfectly plain), and the latter as probably indicating a spelling *foule* in the original.

kno(w), *Hector(s)*, in the folio, and *affliccio(n)*, *woma(n)s*, *woug* (*wrong*), in the quarto; the absence of *quite* and *thee* in the folio, of *in* and *the* in the quarto; intrusive letters in *other(s)*, *honour(s)*, *Armatho(r)*, *S(p)hepheard*, in the folio, and in *thinbellie(s)*, *Let(s) vs.*, *woman(d)*, *lik(l)est*, in the quarto; a superfluous *a* in the folio, a superfluous *of* in the quarto. In the errors made by the folio compositor, working from printed "copy," ordinary misreading can obviously have played but a minimal part, and there seems, therefore, no justification for assigning the precisely similar errors made by the quarto compositor, in setting up from manuscript, to this cause. In view of this, then, and seeing that the folio further misprints *Clo.* for *Ar.*, *farther* for *faire*, *out* for *you*, *keepers* for *speakers*, and *would I* for *I will*, can we feel any confidence that some wholly different cause than was at work in the folio must be called in to account for the quarto misprints *Farborough* for *Tharborough*, *peerelsse* for *parts*, *nuage* for *manage*, *herrite* for *euer*, and *full* for *fowle*? *

It must now be abundantly evident that other causes besides misreading are at work in the production of misprints; indeed, that these other causes are probably more widely operative than errors of the eye. Nothing could in fact be more misleading than the dogma that "Misprints must be accounted for by the Hand-writing." Each several substitution must be considered by itself, and the probability or possibility of its being due to the likeness of manuscript forms judged in the light of palæography. If Dr. Kellner's collections are treated, not as a corpus of misreadings, but as examples for consideration, they will prove of the greatest value to students. At the same time a certain warning is necessary regarding their use. Although individual letters do interchange, it is perhaps more often a question of confusion between groups of letters. Forms which could never be mistaken for one another singly, are often so mistaken in combination. Of course Dr. Kellner is well aware of this, but the necessity or convenience of alphabetic

* I have little doubt myself that misreading did play some part in these errors. Professor Dover Wilson has happily explained *peerelsse* as due to a misreading of the manuscript *pertes* as *perles*, quoting *pertake* and *perticular* as Shakespearian spellings. Such an illustration is more convincing of the value of the method than any accumulation of doubtful examples. Again, for *herrite* (where the folio *euer* is an obvious makeshift) Professor A. W. Pollard has proposed *hermite*, which Professor Wilson supports by the converse error of *madde* for *rude* in *Hamlet*. The latter thinks that for *full* the "copy" probably had *foull*, and that *Farborough* may be intentional. In the case of *nuage* it looks as though a type might have dropped out.

arrangement tends rather to conceal it in his exposition. Moreover, his analysis is sometimes distressingly mechanical. For example, he cites in § 155, which treats of "t misprinted for c", the folio reading *valiant* in *Hamlet*, II. ii. 442, where it is a misprint for *vallanced*. His argument apparently is that the "copy" used for the folio had *vallanced*, and that the compositor misread the second *l* as *i*, the *c* as *t*, and disregarded the *ed*. But *vallanced* is not, as Dr. Kellner asserts, the reading of both quartos, but of the pirated first quarto only. The second reads *valanct*, and there is little doubt that the word stood so in the folio "copy" likewise. The misprint is not a *c : t* error at all, for the *t* is correct; it is a substitution of *ian* for *anc*, which may be a simple minim misreading, or may have come about in other ways.

I pass to palæographic criticism, which receives full treatment in Dr. Kellner's second chapter and illustration in his thirty-four pages of facsimiles. Here there are several preliminary observations to be made. And, to begin with, we must inquire what sort of dramatic manuscripts we are to suppose that an Elizabethan compositor had before him. I think it is common ground now that the great bulk of dramatic "copy" consisted of manuscripts direct from the playhouse, that is, of prompt books actually used in performance, and the essential feature of such manuscripts was that they should be easily readable. In general this *a priori* expectation is borne out by extant evidence. Broadly speaking, it is true that, apart from the ravages of time, the prompt copies that have reached us are above the average in legibility and present few difficulties to any reader familiar with the hands of the period. Of course, prompt copies are not by any means always autograph, and we have to reckon not only with the errors of the compositor who set up the printed edition, but with those of one or more possible scribes intervening between author and printer. This no doubt sensibly increases the likelihood of misreading. At the same time, though prompt copies were not immaculate, they must have contained the texts very much as these were actually spoken on the stage, and the corruption that passed current can hardly, one would imagine, have been either very extensive or profound. It is reasonable, therefore, to doubt whether in the Elizabethan drama the operation of graphic confusion as a source of error is not more restricted than is sometimes supposed.

Now the only pieces of consecutive writing reproduced by

Dr. Kellner are six, namely, Richard Quiney's letter to Shakespeare, letters of Sir Francis Walsingham, of Robert Dudley, Earl of Leicester, and of Sir Roger Owen, a page from Jonson's autograph *Masque of Queens* (much reduced and rather illegible), and a passage from the additional "three pages" in *Sir Thomas More*. But not one of these is typical of the class of manuscripts with which we have to deal. Quiney's is a fairly ordinary hand, but rather crabbed and hardly, one would suppose, that of a ready writer; Walsingham's and Leicester's are mere scribbles that would have been useless in the playhouse; Owen's is a very bad and seemingly illiterate Italian script. Jonson's manuscript is a literary copy made for presentation. *More* is, indeed, a playhouse copy, but the particular passage chosen, though in a well-formed hand, is clearly an author's original draft with corrections; the whole manuscript was never finally revised for production, and had it been would very likely have been transcribed. It seems a pity that, where such ample evidence exists, Dr. Kellner should not have given more examples of the writing of actual dramatic authors of the time, and especially examples of actual prompt books similar to those which may be supposed to have formed the "copy" for the bulk of the Elizabethan printed drama. As it is, the general effect of his facsimiles is to suggest that the dramatic manuscripts that came into the printers' hands were very much worse than is at all likely.

The same effect is produced by the plates in which Dr. Kellner has collected examples of individual letters. He has evidently ransacked documents from about 1550 to 1620 and recorded all the variant forms of letters found therein. It is a most interesting and useful collection, but it naturally includes many antiquated forms which are most unlikely to have figured in Shakespearian manuscripts, and also many individually aberrant forms, the occurrence of which it would be exceedingly rash to postulate in any particular "copy." A sufficient collection of eccentricities would give warrant for the substitution of almost any letter or combination for almost any other. The only safe basis of palæographic conjecture is either the common forms of the normal hand of the time, or the known peculiarities of that of the author. Here the rules of the game have been given a dangerous elasticity.

That this is no accidental result is evident from the opening paragraphs of Chapter II. In these, after mentioning the regular English and Italian hands, Dr. Kellner notes the occurrence of a

mixed hand, in which the forms of the other two are seen to blend in different and inconstant proportions. Next, pointing to the vagaries of Elizabethan spelling and the frequent alternations of pronunciation and grammatical form, he comes to the rather fantastic conclusion that writers adopted "Variety on Principle" (§ 20), and that "The mixed hand was probably the fashion in Queen Elizabeth's time." He then proceeds to argue that Shakespeare must have written a mixed hand, basing his view on the extant signatures, and reinforcing it from the occurrence of certain misprints, which he assumes, of course, to be due to misreadings, and not, as they very well may be, to other causes. He thus obtains the widest possible field for the operation of graphic confusion. But to postulate at will, in any play, any form of script, and any eccentricity of writing, is to allow a latitude of assumption which seriously detracts from the value of the conclusions, and makes one wonder whether played with such laxity the game is worth the candle.

One further criticism suggests itself under this head. From the point of view of textual criticism it is of very little use to know the hand in which a given word was written, unless we also know how it was spelled. It is the union of palæographic with orthographic investigation that gives to Professor Dover Wilson's conjectures their peculiar fascination and sometimes a compelling justness. Not only has Dr. Kellner not explicitly treated this aspect of the problem, but he appears hardly to have considered it at all, being content with the printed form. And where he has touched thereon, his remarks are not always happy: is *betified* a possible Shakespearean spelling of *beautified*? Indeed, one of the least satisfactory features of Dr. Kellner's book is that nearly all his quotations are given in modern spelling. Such a practice is a serious impediment to textual criticism, and can be shown to have had its effect in particular instances.*

At last we come to the question of emendation itself, and the first problem that occurs is how far emendation is necessary. This, of course, is one on which very divergent views have been,

* For example, in defence of his rather unconvincing emendation of *etcet(e)ra* for the famous *Ullorxa* of *Timon*, III. iv. 112, Dr. Kellner begins: "u misprinted for e . . . [is] met with in other passages." But, of course, the folio word is not *Ullorxa*, but *Vllorxa*. The u : e confusion (§ 164) is no use here; what is wanted is a v : e confusion. This may exist, though no example seem to have been found. Anyhow, the point is that Dr. Kellner was on a false scent.

and still are, held. Far be it from me to claim decision on such a matter. But with all deference one may be allowed to express concern on observing from time to time the bad old instinct and itch of interference reasserting itself again in connection with some more or less attractive theory. Dr. Kellner himself writes modestly enough :

A few words may be accorded me on a very delicate point. Has a foreigner any chance of elucidating passages that remained dark to English eyes? I think it can be proved *a priori* that he has. The very fact that an Englishman is, from his boyhood, familiar with Shakespeare stands in the way of his looking at the text with critical eyes . . .

I am afraid that the writer overestimates, even on the part of students, this boyhood familiarity with Shakespeare, and surely the supposed blindness of English critics is inconsistent with the fact that they do in fact recognise as corrupt many passages which they are admittedly unable to amend. It is a subject on which perhaps a little plain speaking is desirable. The contention, which is not always put with Dr. Kellner's delicacy, is that, with respect to the detection and correction of errors in Shakespeare's text, the foreigner stands in as good a position as the Englishman, or even one a little better. This, I feel sure, is a mistake. Nothing is farther from my wish than to "warn off" foreigners from Shakespearian criticism, but at the risk of seeming discourteous and the victim of insular prejudice, I am bound to say that it would be well if they were to realise that, on the contrary, they start with a certain handicap. There is a sense of language that is hard to define and harder still to communicate, but it is none the less real, and it is the essential guide to understanding even across the gulf that separates one period of literature from another. It is part of the mental furniture of the educated native. I willingly admit that once and again a foreigner seems as if by miracle to catch the genius of the language.* I admit, too, that there are dozens of foreign teachers of English with a far greater academic knowledge of the language than nine out of ten educated, even literary, Englishmen. But this is not a question of knowledge, but of instinct, and it is rare to find one of these teachers who can write an English sentence of any complexity as it could possibly have been written by a native.† I believe, therefore, that, if the general sense of educated Englishmen accepts a passage of

* I have just been delighting in Professor Jespersen's *Philosophy of Grammar*.

† The paragraphs I have had occasion to cite from Dr. Kellner's work will perhaps enable readers to judge how far his own command of our language is perfect.

Shakespeare as satisfactory, it is not likely to be seriously corrupt * ; and that such acceptance, while of course not conclusive, is itself an important critical fact of which the foreigner must take account. The application of a wooden logic and supposed criteria of symmetry and balance are mere critical will-o'-the-wisps in the absence of the almost incommunicable sense of linguistic form.

For examples of *cacoëthes emendandi* we need look no further than Dr. Kellner's introductory chapter. He there quotes *Titus Andronicus*, v. iii. 44 : " A pattern, president, and lively warrant," proposing *timely* † ; and 1 *Henry IV.* v. i. 50 : " What with the injuries of a wanton time," proposing *life*. I do not know that commentators or readers have ever been troubled by these expressions ; apparently no emendations have hitherto been proposed, and to me at least the traditional readings seem obviously correct. Indeed, I venture to doubt whether it would have occurred even to Dr. Kellner to suggest alteration, had he not been anxious to adduce instances in support of his much more plausible conjecture of *timeless* for *lifeless* in *The Comedy of Errors*, I. i. 159.

There remains the question of the actual emendations proposed. This aspect of the subject was well developed in a recent review in *The Times Literary Supplement*, and I do not propose to do more than touch upon it here. Dr. Kellner suggests some emendations that are undeniably attractive as well as reasonable from the point of view of handwriting ; he offers us others that, however graphically plausible (and they are not always so), could be accepted by no one with any feeling for language. Even the best are sometimes a little strained. One, of which the author seems, perhaps justifiably, a little proud, is *Pertlot-like* (i.e. Partlet-like) ‡ for the unmeaning *perttaunt like* of *Love's Labour's Lost* (Q), v. ii. 67. The sense is happy, and Shakespeare on two other occasions refers to Chaucer's hen. The change of *pertlot* to *perttat* is not difficult to parallel. But then comes the rub. To suggest that a corrector, at a loss

* I am not forgetting all the nonsense that has been written in defence of manifest corruptions, nor that erroneous readings and interpretations have sometimes passed into current speech.

† " You will search in vain in Shakespeare's vocabulary for another instance of *lively* in the sense required to suit *warrant*." Whether this remark is relevant or not depends on whether Shakespeare wrote *Titus Andronicus*. But the context requires the sense " convincing," and this is well recognised (*N.E.D.*, 4 c.), e.g. Grimstone : " They show the Indians their blind errors, by lively and plaine reasons." And what about *As you Like it*, v. iv. 27 : " Some lively touches of my daughter's favour " ?

‡ Unfortunately *Pert(e)lot* is the Chaucerian not the Shakespearian form.

what to make of this, " put in an [u]n taking it for some French word connected with *tant* ", comes very near throwing up the sponge.* But I am more concerned here with Dr. Kellner's method than with his actual results. A bunch of really convincing emendations would have done much to recommend the palæographical hypothesis ; the present very mixed bag will, I fear, tend to discredit it. But it would be unfair to allow the failure of pioneer efforts to sway our judgment touching the underlying principle. That this is essentially sound I am, for my part, fully convinced, but it requires confining within due limits and applying at once with discretion and insight.

I should remark finally that the book is occasionally marred by extraordinary lapses. On p. 12 we are informed that the " First Quarto " of *Titus Andronicus* " was published in 1600, that is, 17 years before the First Folio ". I cannot doubt that Dr. Kellner really knows that *Titus* was first printed, not in 1600, but in 1594 ; but in any case from 1600 to 1623 is not seventeen years ! On p. 14 we are told that in Sidney's *Arcadia*, as printed in the Cambridge English Classics, " you have *canot* for *cannot*, *cofort* for *comfort*, . . . *fro* for *from*, *the* for *them*, . . . and so on *ad libitum*." Of course, you have nothing of the sort : what you have is *cānot*, *cōfort*, etc. Here I suppose that Dr. Kellner has been badly served by Herr Tauchnitz.

I have for the most part confined my remarks to the broader questions raised by this interesting but provocative work ; to criticise it in detail would mean transgressing all limits of space. It is time to sum up, and it is with regret that I recognise that this can be only in a critical spirit. The book is a notable one, if only because it is the first to treat in a comprehensive way of a very important subject. It should be given the welcome, and judged with the consideration, due to pioneer work. Its extensive collections alike of palæographical forms and of classified misprints will be of assistance to students in the future ; while some of the author's own conjectures may prove suggestive and stand the test of time. But it would be idle to deny that faulty method, serious inaccuracy, and, I fear I must add, defective sense of language, combine to detract from the merits with which the zeal, devotion, and learning of the author should otherwise have endowed his work.

W. W. GREG.

* Professor Dover Wilson, adopting Dr. Moore Smith's suggestion of *planet-like*, supposes that *planit* (a Shakespearian spelling) may have been misread *ptaunt*, and printed *perptaunt* " with the idea that some combination of ' pert ' and ' taunt ' was intended." This is ingenious, but again not wholly convincing.

The King's Office of the Revels, 1610-1622. Fragments of Documents in the Department of Manuscripts, British Museum, transcribed by FRANK MARCHAM, with a Preface by J. P. GILSON. London: Frank Marcham, 53, Chalk Farm Road, N.W.1. Pp. 50, including 19 Collotype Plates. £2. 2s. 1925.

Cotton MS. Tiberius E. X. is a manuscript of the *History of Richard III.* by Sir George Buck, Master of the Revels from 1610 to 1622. It is partly, but according to Mr. Marcham not wholly, in Buck's own hand. It has a dedication to Thomas Howard, second Earl of Arundel, with the skeleton date "In the Kings Office of the Re[ve]ls Peters Hill the . . . of . . . 1619." Certain alterations have been made upon inserted scraps of paper, other matter upon which suggests that they are Revels Office waste utilised by Buck for his literary work. Mr. Marcham has been at the pains to reproduce this other matter in facsimile and transcript, thus making it available for students of the drama and the court stage. Much gratitude is due to him for his skill and enterprise. The fragments are tantalising in their brevity and disconnectedness, and have suffered from fire. As Mr. Marcham has deliberately refrained from any attempt to interpret them, a few notes may be worth while as a beginning. Two groups of documents may be distinguished. One consists partly of letters received by Buck and partly of drafts for letters and warrants by Buck himself. Some of these are concerned with difficulties encountered in obtaining payment of wages due to the Revels officers. There is mention of negotiations with a Mr. Buyley, possibly of the Exchequer, and of a claim of Robert Kirkham for a sum due to his late father. This was doubtless Edward Kirkham, Yeoman of the Revels, and the document cannot therefore be earlier than 1617, as he was still Yeoman in that year. Another scrap refers to some transaction of 1615 as in the past and to Alexander Stafford, who was Clerk Comptroller of the Revels from 1611 to 1617 or later. Another is the end of a letter by Buck dated from St. Peter's Hill on 16 May, 1619. All this is consistent with the use of paper that may have been lying in the office at a date not far removed from that at which Buck's dedication was drafted. The second group of documents is much more interesting. It consists of four lists of plays, bare lists without any indication of their objects. They are not necessarily connected or individually complete. They do not appear to have

been all written at the same time, and Mr. Marcham does not say whether all or any of them are in Buck's hand. That, however, is not of much importance, and I may leave it to palæographers. All the lists have been cancelled by cross or vertical or horizontal lines, and in two cases there has also been an individual cancellation of one or more entries, perhaps at a different date. I reproduce the lists, with a few comments.

A (f. 70^v)

"The Captaine."

Acted by the King's men at court in 1612-13, and printed in the Beaumont and Fletcher collection of 1647. Mr. Marcham only transcribes "The (Cap . . . ?)," but the name seems clear in the collotype.

"The Winters Tale."

Printed in the 1623 Folio and acted by the King's men at court on 18 January, 1624. On the previous August 19 it was found that the book allowed by Sir George Buck was missing, and Sir Henry Herbert reallowed the play on an assurance by John Heminges "that there was nothing profane added or reformed." The new reference may perhaps suggest that the loss of the book was later than about 1619.

"The 2. Noble Kinesmen."

Printed as a play of the King's men in 1634. The play probably dates from 1613, but the new reference is the earliest direct notice of it.

"The Fox."

Produced by the King's men in 1605 or 1606. The entry is separately cancelled in the manuscript.

B. (f. 197^v)

"[The ?] Maior of Quinborough
or Hengist K. of Kent."

The Mayor of Quinborough is in a list of plays belonging to the King's men in 1641 and was printed as theirs in 1661. The alternative title seems to be a later addition in the manuscript. It is also that ascribed to the play in a manuscript copy, which Halliwell-Phillipps thought "of no great antiquity," but which Mr. Marcham assigns to c. 1620.

"[T]he Scholler turnd to schoole
again."

Nothing has previously been known of this.

"The Falce Frend."

Perhaps identical with *The False One* printed in the Beaumont and Fletcher collection of 1647, with an actor-list of the King's men pointing to 1619-23. Mr. Marcham thinks that a mark in the margin may represent the number "2".

"The Maides Tragedy."

Printed as a King's play in 1619.

"3 The Cambridge Playe of
Albumazar and Trinculo."

Acted at Cambridge before James I. in 1615 and printed in the same year. Mr. Marcham has some doubt about the "3," but it seems clear in the collotype.

"The Tradgedy of Ham[let ?]."

"The Tradgedy of Jeronimo."

Presumably *The Spanish Tragedy*, of which editions were issued in 1618 and 1623. The play was revised for the Admiral's men in 1601 and 1602, and was probably in the hands of the Palsgrave's men, as their successors, *c.* 1620.

"4 The History of Phil[aster]
or Love lies a bleed[ing]."

Acted twice by the King's men at court in 1612-1613, and printed as theirs in 1620.

[Two entries followed in this list of a comedy and a tragedy, of which the titles are lost by mutilation.]

C (f 211v)
"[Kni]ght of Malta."

Printed in the Beaumont and Fletcher collection of 1647, with an actor-list of the King's men pointing to 1615-19.

"[Seco]nd part of Falstaff
[not p]laid y^{ts} 7. yeres."

I am responsible for this conjectural restoration of the mutilated

entry. I suppose the play to be 2 *Henry IV.*, and we seem to get a very exact dating in the winter of 1619-20, since both *Sir John ffalstaffe* and *The Hotspur* were played by the King's men at court during that of 1612-13.

D (f. 247)

"Witt at [Seuerall Weapons ?]."

Printed in the Beaumont and Fletcher collection of 1647 with an Epilogue "at the reviving of this Play," by what company is unknown; not in the King's men's play-list of 1647 or the Cockpit list of 1639.

"the Bridegr[oome]."

The King's men's repertory of 1641 included *The Bridegroom and the Madman*, conceivably identical with the play here recorded and conceivably also with *The Nice Valour or the Passionate Madman*, printed in the Beaumont and Fletcher collection of 1647 with a prologue "at the reviving of this play."

"An ould Lawe . a . . ."

The Old Law; or a new way to please you was printed in 1656, but is generally supposed to date in some form from 1599.

"Henrye the vna . . ."

If Mr. Marcham has read the manuscript rightly, I cannot identify the play.

"A ffaire Quarrell."

Printed in 1617, as a play given before the King by Prince Charles' men, and again in 1622.

"All's Lost by Lust."

Printed in 1633 as a play of the Lady Elizabeth's men and in succession to them Queen Henrietta's.

"the Cittye."

Not otherwise known.

"the House is Haunte[d]."

Not otherwise known.

"Look to the Ladye."

A play of this name by James Shirley was entered in the

Stationers' Register on 11 March, 1640, but is not extant. The prologue to *The School of Compliment* makes it clear that no play by Shirley was produced before 1626.

"Titus, and Vespasian."

A very unexpected entry. The *Titus and Vespasian* played by Strange's men at the Rose in 1592-3 is often conjectured to have been revised as *Titus Andronicus* for Sussex's men in 1594. Can it have had an independent existence to the middle of the seventeenth century? Or is this a distinct play, hitherto unknown? The name can hardly have clung to *Titus Andronicus* itself.

"A Turkes too good for hi . . ."

Not otherwise known.

"the scilent Woeman"

Printed in Jonson's folio of 1616 as a Queen's Revels play. This ascription is repeated in the separate print of 1620. But possibly the play had already by this date passed to the King's men, who gave it at court in 1636.

"the Dutch Curtizan."

Printed as a Queen's Revels play in 1605 and twice acted at court by the Lady Elizabeth's men in 1613. This entry is separately cancelled in the manuscript.

"D'Ambois."

Bussy D'Ambois was printed as a Paul's play in 1607. But it afterwards passed to the King's men, and a prologue in the 1641 edition makes it probable that both Field, who belonged to the company from 1615 to the summer of 1619, and afterwards Taylor played in it for them.

"A woemans a wethercock."

Printed as a Queen's Revels play in 1612, and found neither in the King's repertory of 1641 nor the Cockpit one of 1639. The entry is separately cancelled in the manuscript.

What then is the nature of these lists? They can hardly be lists of plays licensed either for performance or for publication, since several of them had been both performed and published before

Buck became Master of the Revels. They might be fragments of a catalogue of copies of "allowed" plays kept in the Revels Office, and if so, the obscure figures in List B might refer to a grouping in volumes. We do not, however, know that Buck did keep such copies, although Herbert laid it down in 1633 that they ought to be supplied by the companies, and in 1624 re-allowed, without a fee, "*Jugurth*, an old play, allowed by Sir George Bucke, and burnt with his other books." But whether he was referring to a fire at the Revels Office, or to that in 1621 at the Fortune, to which *Jugurtha*, an old play of the Admiral's men, probably belonged, we do not know. On the whole, it seems to me most likely that the lists represent plays which the Revels Office had at some time or times under consideration for performance at court. The figures in B may indicate dates for which plays were needed, and the entries cancelled by horizontal lines may be of plays considered and ultimately rejected. If I am right, the entry for *Falstaff* points clearly to the winter of 1619-20 for C, and although it must not be taken for granted that all the lists belong to the same year, my notes will show that there is independent evidence, in the form of actor-lists, publishers' imprints, and the like, which is consistent with the production or revival of quite a substantial proportion of the plays concerned about 1619 or 1620. We have therefore, thanks to Mr. Marcham, a conspectus of the plays thought sufficiently interesting for court performances at a time intermediate between that of the one already known for 1612-13 and the beginning of Herbert's systematic record in 1622.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

Sir Gawain and the Green Knight. Edited by J. R. R. TOLKIEN and E. V. GORDON. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1925. Pp. xxviii + 212. 7s. 6d. net.

NOT the least of the merits of this excellent edition is that it does not profess to epitomize all the "literature" that has gathered around the poem: the student may best investigate these matters himself, with the aid of Mr. J. E. Wells' *Manual*. Thus it has been possible to cut down the Introduction to a minimum without lessening its value, and the editors have been able to devote their chief attention to determining "the meaning of the author's actual words (in so far as the manuscript is fair to him)."

They have given us a pleasantly short discussion of date and district of origin; a sufficient account of grammar and metre; a text which would be hard to beat; notes which are at once learned, discriminating, and interesting; and a model glossary.

The notes deal very fully with the characters, setting, and topography of the poem. Especially interesting are the comments on Gawain's itinerary (note to ll. 691 *seq.*), and on the dress and armour of the period (*e.g.* notes to ll. 568, 606, 1738).

The text is conservative, the editors as a rule resisting the pleasant temptation to make conjectural emendations of metrically irregular lines. That they can emend, and emend brilliantly, may be seen from the note on l. 1941.

Other instances of sound emendation are: *browe* to *browen* (l. 1457); *bot* to *both* (l. 144); *glaumand* to *glaum and* (l. 46); *bay* to *balz* (l. 967)—back-formation from *bay-window* is not inconceivable; but the parallels they adduce justify their adoption of *balz*.

Instances of restoration of MS. readings which earlier editors had departed from, are: *lere* (l. 1334), *schafted* (l. 1467), *trestes alofte* (l. 1648).

The plan of keeping the printed page free from what the editors call "the trail of the passing editor," has much to recommend it in a book like this; but their omission to state in the footnotes the authors of the emendations they have adopted, should be rectified in a second edition.

Of the many fresh etymologies, interpretations, or both, given in Notes and Glossary, only a few examples can be mentioned here: *blauer*, *misy*, *rones*, *rupes*, *strokes*, *pulged*, *ymbetorne*, *won*, and the interesting Welsh etymologies of *Gawan* and *Gryngolet* (ll. 109 n., 597 n.); *mere* (l. 153), *pured* (ll. 154, 1737), *barlay* (l. 296), *fraystes* (l. 503), *bitvene* (l. 611 n.), *hadet* (l. 681), *pyned* (l. 769), *trochet* (l. 795), *towrast* (l. 1663), *skayned* (l. 2167), *grwe* (l. 2251), *spennefote* (l. 2316 n.), *vnhap* (l. 2511 n.).

We may now pass from appreciation to criticism.

A few other emendations might be suggested:

l. 352. Surely *ar* has dropped out after *hazerer*, if indeed the right reading is not *hazer ar*.

l. 1313. In spite of the occurrence of a weak pret. in the 14th cy., one is tempted to read *ryses*; for the tense cf. l. 2085.

l. 1368. Clearly *bette* (p.p.) is a scribal error for *bet* (cf. *Gleanness*,

l. 1012). The rhyme *bet*—*met* might therefore be added to the examples given on p. xxi.

l. 1440. Has *sat* dropped out before *pat*?

l. 1595. That Napier's emendation gives a better meaning, is open to question. I take it that the boar gave up the struggle and was carried away by the stream.

I would add two emendations of W. P. Ker's:

l. 660. *aiguere to fynde*; l. 1909. *brayn* (cf. l. 286).

On interpretations, given in Notes on Glossary, I offer the following comments:

l. 67. Seeing that the meanings of *on hiȝ* ("loudly") and *bi hond* ("in person") are given in the Glossary, one is startled to see the passage mistranslated in the notes. Presumably it was kisses that they "*ȝelde hem bi hond*."

l. 113. Does not "*hymseluen*" refer to the king?

l. 235. *growe-grene* requires a note, and as a compound word it would be better with a hyphen. In spite of its form, *growe* cannot be an infin.; for it obviously refers not to the act (a) of growing, but to the things (b) that exhibit the act of growing. The *N.E.D.* records 16th-cy. instances of *grow* for *growth* (a): there is no difficulty in assuming a 14th-cy. use of it for *growth* (b).

l. 243. Here also a hyphen would improve. I take it that *swoghe-sylence* ("swoon-silence") primarily denotes the hush of expectation and anxiety following upon the knocking-out of a champion.

l. 327. *bayþen*. I do not understand what is meant by the remark "the infin. of this verb would be *bayþe*."

l. 372. *kyrf* = "cutting edge," and to "*sette on kyrf*" clearly means to "deal a straight blow."

l. 473. *kynde of* here probably means "natural to."

l. 483. The general reader needs help here: *as derrest myȝt falle* = "in order of rank."

l. 494. *staf-ful*. For the semasiology of this word: I take it that the adj. must have been applied primarily to the hand that held the heavy lance.

l. 504. A note on *hit* is needed: indef. obj., cf. "fight it," "lord it." Earliest *N.E.D.* example, 1548.

l. 504. Does *þe weder of þe worlde* mean "the worldwide storms," "the equinoctial gales"?

l. 763. I think that *segge* means "say" ("say three times" =

"about three times"), although the *N.E.D.* has no example of this usage before 1596.

l. 1009. Does *to poynte* refer to rhyming by letter, to making alliterative verse?

l. 1109. *Que per lende* I take to be a dative. The interpretation of *lere* as "a worthless something," *i.e.* "nothing," is not altogether convincing: one would expect a comparative here, such as *lupere*.

l. 1161. *wende* is surely not a noun here, but a pret. sg., with omission of the nominative relative, as frequently in ME.: "each that passed through the wood."

l. 1174. *abloy*. One is not convinced that the *N.E.D.* interpretation is wrong: in an interjection an "irregular" vowel-development is always possible. And why should the lord keep on "riding forth" and "alighting"? Also *for* surely means not "by" or "with," but "by reason of": "For joy the lord full oft and lightheartedly shouted his 'tally-ho!'"

ll. 1263-7. A very clear explanation is offered of the sense and application of this difficult passage. But a better interpretation of the third line was given us by W. P. Ker: "and have received other extensive generosity from other folk, of their own free will" (cf. ON. *af sjálfs-dáðum*).

l. 1573. I do not understand the note on *irked*: the syntax is normal.

l. 1726. *titleres*. Surely this does not mean "ticklers" but "entitlers," "persons calling him names."

l. 2181. *glodes* is probably a variant of *clodes*. Cf. *gleymous*, *cleymous* in *Prompt. Parv.*

It is an easy task to search out imperfections in other men's good work; and the above comments on a few details will lead no one to depreciate one of the best editions of a Middle English text that have yet appeared.

J. H. G. GRATTAN.

Swift: *les Années de Jeunesse et le "Conte du Tonneau."*

ÉMILE PONS. Strasbourg, Paris: Librairie Istra; Humphrey Milford: Oxford University Press. 1925. Pp. xii + 410. 25 francs (8s. 6d.) net.

To France must be conceded the distinction of an early and not wholly inadequate recognition of Swift's genius. Several of the

political pamphlets, among them *The Conduct of the Allies* and *Some Remarks on the Barrier Treaty*, soon found their way into French. These and other translations appeared in editions printed outside the borders of France, as did also French translations of Swift's two most important works, *A Tale of a Tub* and *Gulliver's Travels*. The earlier of the two waited seventeen years, to appear in 1721 in two independent translations. A partial and imperfect rendering by a René Macé, under the title of *Les Trois Justaucorps*, was published in Dublin, but soon passed out of sight; for in the same year, at the Hague, came Justus Van Effen's *Le Conte du Tonneau*, a complete and competent translation, although Van Effen was not altogether successful in turning the incisive directness of Swift's style. No second edition seems to have been called for until, possibly in consequence of Swift's popularity in France as the author of *Gulliver's Travels*, between 1733 and 1757 several further editions of Van Effen's translation were published. *Gulliver's Travels* also prompted two independent and almost simultaneous French translations, and this time within less than a year of the English original. The earlier of the two was probably that published at the Hague; the other, done into French by the Abbé Desfontaines, was printed in Paris. Desfontaines quite missed the wit and humour of his author, his conscience as a translator was easy, he tried to turn Swift's satire into a moral story, but his translation has survived as the version generally accepted in France. It gave Swift an immediate fame on the other side of the Channel; and it has since appeared in something like one hundred and seventy editions or abridgments.

In the latter half of the eighteenth century, with the turn of the tide toward Romanticism, the popularity of Swift began to wane in France. During this period he seems to have been little regarded, even among men of letters; what little was known of him was governed by a translation of Orrery's *Remarks*, or by Voltaire's "Rabelais perfectionné," a description with enough of truth to be, in and by itself, misleading. With the advent of the nineteenth century interest in Swift revived; editions of the *Voyages de Gulliver* reappeared; and later came several critical studies. Prévost-Paradol's *Jonathan Swift, sa Vie et ses Œuvres* (1856), brief but understanding, was soon followed by Hermile Reynald's *Biographie de Jonathan Swift* (1860), and by the detractions of Taine in the fourth volume of his *Histoire de la Littérature Anglaise* (1864). Nearer our

own time, Mlle. Henriette Cordelet's *Swift* (1907) is without critical importance; and the authoress failed to avail herself of material then readily available.

Last year Miss Sybil Goulding's *Swift en France* marked what may prove the beginning of another stage in Swift's literary fortunes. Her admirable sketch, accompanied by useful bibliographies, is now followed by the first volume of a far larger and more ambitious study—no less than a new and complete life of Swift by M. Émile Pons of the University of Strasbourg. The purpose of his book is not unlike that of M. Paul Dottin's recent *Daniel de Foe et ses Romans*, although the plan differs, for the course of the narrative is broken by lengthy excursions in literary criticism, whereas M. Dottin gives us first a consecutive biography, before turning to examine the romances. Either method has its advantages and difficulties. M. Dottin has given us a vivid and entertaining life of our first great journalist. M. Émile Pons has not the same verve and sense of humour. He has also a more trying subject-matter. It would be unfair to surmise what success he is likely to have in presenting Swift as a whole man. His first volume only carries his hero to his thirty-seventh year. We are promised two further books, one continuing the story to the fall of the Tory administration in 1714, the other following Swift's life to the end, discussing more particularly the Stella and Vanessa relationship and his second great period of literary activity.

The biography M. Émile Pons has set himself to write is not only far more thorough than any yet offered to French readers, but is planned apparently on a scale larger than any English life of Swift. He is happily placed in being able to make use of labours providing new knowledge since Forster and Sir Henry Craik wrote their biographies. Temple Scott's edition of the *Prose Works*, Dr. Elrington Ball's edition of the *Correspondence*, the letters of *Vanessa and Jonathan Swift* edited by A. Martin Freeman, *A Tale of a Tub* edited by Guthkelch and D. Nichol Smith, furnish some new material as well as a better and more ordered text. M. Pons is justified in his claim: "Une synthèse nouvelle est possible et, dans une certaine mesure, s'impose déjà."

The earlier part of his study, extending to over one hundred pages, is a classified review of the documents, authorities, biographies, and critical monographs now available. These are arranged in part chronologically and in part by their method or character. The device leads to some confusion, perhaps not altogether easy to avoid.

Nobody will question the fitness of placing Scott with the "élaboration romantique ;" but Churton Collins is also grouped with the Romanticists on the ground that his biography is "une sorte d'apologétique, très lyrique." On the whole, also, M. Pons rates Churton Collins too highly, although he is not blind to his haste and want of logical clearness. More strangely still, Monck Mason falls into the same group. Nevertheless M. Pons estimates Monck Mason's work justly, and rightly censures Sir Henry Craik's disparagement ; for, if the chapter on Swift might have been better ordered, it was, when written, one of the first true attempts at objective research ; and it is further to be remembered that Monck Mason was occupied with combating the inaccuracies of Scott. Mrs. Pilkington's *Memoirs* are championed against the excessive depreciation it has been customary to accord them. Frail and unreliable adventuress she may have been, her reminiscences are not unbiassed, but the picture she has sketched of the Dean and his surroundings is at first-hand and realistic. Those who have dismissed her curtly have, not infrequently, borrowed from her without acknowledgment.

In the period covered by this volume there is but little opportunity of adding anything to the facts set out in previous biographies ; but, eschewing the more doubtful anecdotes, M. Pons gives a clear and consecutive story of the development of Swift's character and the gradual change in his relationship to his patron. The personality of Sir William Temple, the households at Sheen and Moor Park, are excellently sketched as a background to the narrative. In one or two particulars he is able to correct Sir Henry Craik. The latter (Vol. I. c. ii.) implies that the Pindaric odes were an outcome of Swift's brief residence in Oxford. The inspiration to this form of writing can be shown to antedate that time. A letter of Swift's, written on May 3, 1692, printed among the supplemental letters of Dr. Elrington Ball's edition of the *Correspondence* (Vol. I.), shows that the ode to Archbishop Sancroft was not, as its note states, "written in May, 1689," but that he had certainly been engaged upon it before he went up to Oxford in 1692. The address to Sir William Temple, professing to have been written in June, 1689, may also have been antedated ; but it *may* also, not improbably, have been an earlier composition than the other. At all events the suggestion that Swift's Pindaric flights are attributable to direct Oxford influence can be dismissed.

An interesting theory, relative to these early days, advanced by

M. Emile Pons, traverses the story, accepted by Forster and Craik, that Mrs. Johnson had with her at Moor Park both her daughters, Esther and Anne. Either writer represents Anne as the younger of two. M. Pons, relying on the writer of the article in the *Gentleman's Magazine* for November, 1757, ill informed as that article is in some respects, believes that Anne was older than her sister, and, as represented by that writer, "brought up in London," not in the household of Sir William Temple. This surmise is supported by a reference to Anne in the *Journal to Stella*, under October 3, 1710: "This morning Stella's sister came . . . your sister looked very well, and seems a good modest sort of girl." M. Pons remarks, "Swift parle évidemment ici d'une personne qu'il a vue pour la première fois." But is this a necessary deduction? Swift entered the service of Sir William Temple in 1689; he left Moor Park finally in 1699; in 1710 he was unlikely to have seen Anne for many years; and his words would not be an unnatural comment upon meeting Stella's sister for the first time as a young woman.

In adopting this belief, however, M. Pons is leading up toward his resuscitation of a suggestion now generally abandoned for want of definite proof, that Esther Johnson was a natural daughter of Sir William Temple. It is impossible here to review the arguments for and against. M. Pons notes the position as a gentlewoman Esther occupied in the household, the care bestowed on her education, her bearing and manners, her delicate health, which might be inherited from Temple, the resemblance alleged to Temple himself and to Kneller's portrait of Lady Portland, Temple's niece, and finally, the legacy of lands in Ireland "au lieu d'une banale somme d'argent." He makes no mention, on the other hand, of the entry of her father's name, "Edward Johnson," in the register of Esther's baptism at Richmond, on March 20, 1680-81. This may not be proof positive to the contrary; and the question, in any event, as that of Swift's marriage to Stella, is not likely now to meet with a convincing solution.

An analysis and interpretation of *The Battle of the Books* and *A Tale of a Tub* occupy nearly half the volume. M. Pons discusses their composition, sources, allegory, topical references at length, and concludes with a study of "L'humour de Swift et sa puissance." The commentary often carries us far afield in its discussion of "le mythe éolien, l'estétomorphisme, le 'mythe animal'." No doubt they are there, even if many readers have lost little by scarcely

recognising them for what they are ; and M. Pons has rendered a good service in his elaborate exegesis.

This volume is the outcome of many years of study. M. Pons has written a large book, which gathers up the supplementary researches of others since the last biography of Swift of any account ; and he has been able to add a few additional pieces of information or inference on his own part. He is thoroughly at home with his authorities, he has marshalled his documents, his footnotes and references are ample, he writes both with knowledge and judgment. The work he has done is of present value to English as well as French students, and his next volume may well be of even greater value.

Attention may be called to two opportunities for improvement. A better and more fully tabulated index is demanded by the text of the book. A name or word followed by a congested group of page numbers does not greatly assist reference to any special aspect of person or subject. Nor is the index as complete as it might be. In the text and notes, for example, Miss Longe's edition of Lady Giffard's letters is more than once referred to, but "Longe" does not appear in the index, and we are compelled to resort to "Giffard." Secondly, and this applies more particularly to the footnotes, there are too many errors in the printing of English names, words and passages quoted. It is a pity that, in a book which ranges widely over English letters, memoirs, and works of literary criticism, more care was not given to reading the proofs of passages cited in the original.

HAROLD WILLIAMS.

Studies in the First Folio, written for the Shakespeare Association in Celebration of the First Folio Tercentenary. By M. H. SPIELMANN, J. DOVER WILSON, SIR SIDNEY LEE, R. CROMPTON RHODES, W. W. GREG, ALLARDYCE NICOLL. With an introduction by SIR ISRAEL GOLLANCZ. London : Humphrey Milford ; Oxford University Press. 1924. 18s. net.

THIS volume of lectures delivered at King's College, London, in 1923, opens with a general introduction by Sir Israel Gollancz giving in convenient form the leading facts of the history of the publication of the First Folio. A series of facsimiles of the more

important Shakespearean entries in the *Stationers' Register* adds to the value of the paper. The introduction is followed by the longest and in some ways most important paper in the volume, Mr. Spielmann's article on "Shakespeare's Portraiture," a very complete and valuable treatise on a subject which has been obscured by much ill-informed discussion. The excellent series of forty-seven plates which accompanies it includes, besides portraits of Shakespeare, some remarkable examples of the misrepresentations of early antiquaries, or their engravers, in recording monuments, and of the engravers in copying from one another, which show conclusively that it is quite unsafe to base any theory of alterations having been at some time or other made in the Stratford monument on the engraving in Dugdale's *Warwickshire* of 1656. It seems evident that even the better antiquaries were satisfied with illustrations drawn from the roughest notes. Probably indeed nothing more was intended than the recording of the essential heraldic and genealogical evidence afforded by such monuments, the artistic or architectural qualities being regarded as a minor matter of which a mere conventional representation was sufficient. Mr. Spielmann shows clearly that there is no valid evidence of any substantial alteration of the monument since its first erection before 1622.

Mr. Spielmann's article, though it deals minutely with the Droeshout portrait prefixed to the First Folio, is much wider in its scope than most of the other papers in the book and has been issued in a separate form, in which indeed it will be more convenient, as well as in this volume. The remaining articles, save that of Sir Sidney Lee, are more closely related to one another in that they all bear on the text of the First Folio; nevertheless the volume as a whole suffers to some extent from the usual defect of a series of lectures by different scholars on varied aspects of a single matter, that the treatment of the particular subjects has been dictated rather by considerations of length and circumstances of delivery than by the question of suitability to the particular case. While one or two of the articles, such as those by Sir Sidney Lee and Dr. W. W. Greg, are, within the limits of their very different subjects, complete and satisfactory, most readers will, I think, feel that the papers of Professor Dover Wilson, Mr. Crompton Rhodes, and Professor Nicoll all suffer in their several ways from sketchiness and insufficient documentation. The most striking instance of this is Professor Dover Wilson's paper on the nature of the "copy" for the First Folio, a subject

which is of course at the very root of all criticism of the Shakespearean text. All students would welcome most heartily a book—it would need to be one of some length—by Mr. Wilson on the subject; he is indeed writing one bit by bit in his introductions to the “New Shakespeare,” but I venture to doubt whether they will gain much from so summary a treatment as we have here. To give one instance, the important question of the relation of the punctuation of the quarto and folio texts of *Hamlet* is illustrated by the quotation of a single short passage, and a passage, moreover, in which many may feel that whereas the Quarto reading, which Mr. Wilson so much prefers, is the more subtle, that of the Folio is both more Elizabethan and more like Shakespeare. It is sometimes astonishingly easy to transform a passage which is capable of a plain and straightforward meaning into one of extreme subtlety by varying the punctuation, as it is in speech by varying the stress or intonation, but, though the more subtle form may appeal more strongly to us to-day, it by no means follows that it better represents the intention of the author. All readers will, I think, wish Mr. Wilson’s article had been much more detailed, but this does not mean that, within the limits imposed upon it, it is anything but an excellent piece of work. Sir Sidney Lee’s “Survey of First Folios” adds much to the human side of the census printed in 1902 with the Clarendon Press facsimile and the additions which he printed in the *Library* in 1906, the most remarkable single fact being perhaps the possession by the well-known American collector, Mr. H. C. Folger, of thirty-five copies of the First Folio. The paper on the “First Folio and the Elizabethan Stage” by Mr. R. Crompton Rhodes is another which seems to suffer from insufficient documentation. There are some excellent points in it, but here again we want rather a book than an hour’s lecture. Dr. Greg gives an excellent account of the circumstances of the publication of the *First Folio*, but expressly disclaims having anything new to say. In the final paper Professor Allardyce Nicoll, in discussing the editors of Shakespeare from the First Folio to Malone, makes an interesting point with regard to the possibility of stage traditions persisting from the time of Shakespeare himself having influenced the post-Folio quartos. If this can be shown to be the case—and there seems some evidence of it—the modern editorial practice of ignoring all early editions after the Folio must evidently be reconsidered.

R. B. McK.

A Midsummer Night's Dream. ("The New Shakespeare.")
 Cambridge: at the University Press. 1924. Pp. xxii., 176.
 Price 6s. net.

IT is an inevitable inconvenience of modern editorial methods that such a book as this cannot be reviewed adequately except at very great length. It is no question of saying that the work is well or ill done, that the text is careful or careless, and that the notes are sufficient or perfunctory, but of dealing with a complicated argument or series of arguments of which every step needs careful consideration in every detail. Some day I hope that the completed "New Shakespeare" may receive full discussion in this *Review*, but in the meantime all that is possible is to welcome the volumes as published, adding a brief note of the outstanding features of each. Like others that have already appeared, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* is provided with a pleasantly written introduction by Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch and a careful and sufficient "Stage-History" by Mr. Harold Child; but the most important part of it is Professor Dover Wilson's treatment of the text, and especially his essay on "The Copy for *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, 1600." The conclusions to which the writer comes are that the play was first handled by Shakespeare (whether as a revision of an older play or not is uncertain) in 1592, rehandled in 1594, and rehandled once again in 1598. At one of these revisions—it is not clear which, it was revised for the special purpose of fitting it for use at a wedding—whose is unknown, and there is good reason for thinking that the copy used by the printer of the 1600 quarto was a theatrical prompt-book with Shakespeare's autograph revisions. Mr. Dover Wilson appears indeed to regard the whole play as having been in Shakespeare's autograph, but I think that his argument does not go beyond showing that certain revisions were autograph. However, the point is a minor one.

In general Mr. Dover Wilson certainly has a strong case. That there was one revision seems certain, whether there were two is perhaps more doubtful, though on the whole it is probable that there were. On the other hand, the dates will probably be challenged. For my own part it seems to me that the association of the nine muses "mourning for the death of learning, late deceased in beggary" with the death of Robert Greene on September 3, 1592, is to say the least of it doubtful. Greene had indeed, it would seem,

some slight pretensions to scholarship, but I question whether any Elizabethan would have thought of "learning" in connection with a pamphleteer and writer for the public stage. Nor is it at all clear that Greene died in "beggary." He may indeed have been in financial difficulties at the time of his death, but he had been producing a good deal of work just before, and we know that his pamphlets were in demand among the publishers and were, for the times, well paid. The real reason for the troubles of his last days was, if I am not much mistaken, the plague. In August and September of 1592 the plague was not indeed yet at its height, but it was obviously beginning and we may, I think, assume that all who had no urgent business in London would tend to keep away. In the case of a man like Greene, normally, we may suppose, living from hand to mouth, it would only need the absence of his patron for the time being, of the theatrical company with which he was connected, and his personal friends, for him to get into straits, and who in plague time would be anxious to receive a sick man? Greene may have died miserably, but his death was certainly no typical case of neglected learning.* Nor do I feel any more certain of the allusion to the lion which did not appear at a Scotch royal banquet in 1594. The argument seems to be that, to judge from the use that Shakespeare made of it, the incident must have caused much amusement in London, and that because it caused much amusement in London this incident must have been the one alluded to. But surely it is *a priori* most improbable that such an incident as this at the court of a foreign king could have been sufficiently well known for an allusion to it to have appealed to a London audience; while on the other hand the jesting about the lion is of the most obvious nature (any curate organising a village pantomime would assuredly, if there were a lion, make jests about its frightening the ladies), and there can be no real need to look for an origin. The weather argument based on II. i. 89 ff. seems to have more weight, as fixing a revision in 1594, but even here we must remember that a

* In times of patronage the learned seem generally to have found some one to relieve them, but one would like to know the date of the death of Christopher Ocland, who appears to have been a real example of learning deceasing in beggary soon after 1590. As his *Anglorum Prælia* had been in 1580 appointed to be taught in all grammar and free schools, it is perhaps not impossible that he might have been sufficiently well known to afford the point of such an allusion as this. There is also the case of Torquato Tasso, the misery of whose later years was of course notorious. Actually he was relieved before his death in 1595, but was this known in England?

comparatively short spell of bad weather might easily be alluded to by one writing at the time and for immediate performance: a week's rain will make most of us feel and declare that we have not seen the sun for months. In any case, however, these allusions may not have been to actual fact, for according to the argument they *remained* in the text through a revision four years later when there was nothing abnormal about the weather. But such points do not affect the main argument. I have only mentioned them because I cannot but feel that in some Shakespearean work of late there has been a tendency to treat weak evidence as gaining in weight from the mere accident that there happens to be no other evidence at all—a dangerous piece of false reasoning. Not the slightest regard would have been given to the possible allusions to Greene and the Scottish lion if some famous scholar had died in penury in 1593 or a lion had caused Elizabeth's ladies a fright in 1595.

One typographical point I must mention. Could not the Cambridge Press incur the trifling expense of providing a set of long-s ligatures for use when the early spellings are quoted? These fi's, fh's, etc., are very ugly.

R. B. McK.

William Mason : A Study in Eighteenth-Century Culture.

By JOHN W. DRAPER, Ph. D. The New York University Press.
1924. Pp. xvi. + 397. \$6.50.

PROFESSOR DRAPER has spent ten years of his life in compiling 322 pages of text and some 75 pages of appendices, bibliographies, etc., about William Mason, the biographer of Gray and friend of Horace Walpole. Mason's achievements and abilities are not over-rated by Dr. Draper, who acquiesces in his merited loss of popularity to-day and talks of him as "a rather small person in the history of English culture." If, as we think, this opinion is fully borne out by the facts, was it necessary to devote so much time and labour to its justification? Dr. Draper certainly attempts to treat Mason as the typical exponent of the tendencies of his age; he sees in him the unconscious representative of his generation in his attitude towards life and thought, his dilettante interest in the arts, and above all in his various contributions to letters. "He was typical, not only in literature, but, to the degree of his powers, in painting, music,

gardening, and indeed in most of the matters that attracted the cultivated man of his generation. His age, furthermore, is particularly interesting as the crucial period in the struggle between Neo-classical and Sentimental theories of art and of life. Mason strangely commingles these two elements; and the distinguishing of them in his biography, in his thought, and in his creative work, illuminates the cultural background of the generation preceding Coleridge and Wordsworth, and illustrates the tendencies of English Romanticism before the advent of German influence."

It may be so, and Dr. Draper's scholarly thesis elaborates and proves his contention. But we do not feel that he has been able to deduce much that is new or illuminating about the age from his study of a worthy and good-natured mediocrity—the over-minuteness of which could be justified only if it had led to a fuller understanding of the period.

EDITH J. MORLEY.

Early Tudor Composers. By WILLIAM H. GRATTAN FLOOD.
Oxford University Press; London: Humphrey Milford. 1925.
Pp. 121. 6s. net.

THIS series of biographical sketches of thirty-two musicians and composers of the period 1485-1555 should be known to all students of our early stage, for although of course its interest is mainly for the historian of music, several of those who are here recorded have also a place in the history of literature and of the drama. Among these are William Cornish, who became master of the children of the Chapel Royal in 1509, and, it would seem, for some years after that took an important part in the plays at Court; John Redford, author of the interlude of *Wit and Science*, which Dr. Grattan Flood dates in 1538-9, *i.e.* some five years earlier than the generally accepted date, and Richard Edwards, author of *Damon and Pythias* and of a number of poems in *The Paradise of Dainty Devices*. The majority of the composers with whom Dr. Grattan Flood deals seem hitherto, even in the history of music, to have been little more than names, while even in the case of those some account of whose life is found in the usual books of reference, he has been able to add much new and interesting information and to clear up many obscurities.

R. B. McK.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE

BY EDITH C. BATHO

ANGLIA, Vol. XLIX. (neue Folge XXXVII.), May 1925—

Der Werdegang von John Galsworthys Welt—und Kunstanschauung
(F. C. Steinermayr), pp. 97-152.

A detailed critical study of Galsworthy as thinker and artist.

Longfellows *Evangeline* und Tegnér's *Frithiof-Saga*. Ein Beitrag
zu Longfellow's "Quellen" (Dr. Appellmann), pp. 153-72.

Neue Beiträge zu einer endgültigen Lösung der Legendenprologfrage
bei Chaucer (Hugo Lange), pp. 173-80.

Ein Briefwechsel Hobhouses und Stratford Cannings betreffend das
Denkmal Byrons (Alfred Stern), pp. 181-2.

Weitere Beiträge zur altenglischen Wortforschung (Otto B. Schlutter),
pp. 183-92.

On *gedingan*, *wēnþ* and *wēne*, *ūma*, *uma*, *ume*, *mare*, on *muþan* and *mūþa*.

BODLEIAN QUARTERLY RECORD, Vol. IV., May 15, 1925—

The "Reserved" Shelley Papers in the Bodleian Library (R. H. H.),
pp. 218-22.

Note on the papers; two letters of Shelley, not hitherto printed.

BULLETIN OF THE JOHN RYLANDS LIBRARY, MANCHESTER, Vol. IX.,
January 1925—

A Sketch of the History of Shakespeare's Influence on the Continent
(C. H. Herford), pp. 20-62.

—July—

The Apple Mystery in Arthurian Legend (Jessie L. Weston),
pp. 417-30.

A Russian Shakespearean (C. H. Herford), pp. 453-480.

Account of Alexander Sergéjevich Pushkin and the influence of Shakespeare
on his tragedy of *Boris Godunov*.

William Tindale and the Earlier Translators of the Bible into English
(Henry Guppy), pp. 452-84.

CORNHILL MAGAZINE, April 1925—

Fragments of Autobiography. II. (Thomas Hughes: edited by
Henry C. Shelley), pp. 472-8.

Continued in May (III. and IV.), pp. 563-72.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, Vol. LIX., May 1925—

Der Puritanismus in Neuengland (F. Schönnemann), pp. 173-92.

H. G. Wells' Vereinigung von Imperialismus und Pazifismus und ihre Grundlagen in der englischen Literatur (W. Halfmann), pp. 193-259.

Zur Psychologie von Robert Brownings *A Toccata of Galuppi's* (Friedrich Bitzkat), pp. 316-9.

HERRIGS ARCHIV FÜR DAS STUDIUM DER NEUEREN SPRACHEN UND LITERATUREN, Vol. CXLVIII. (New Series XLVIII.), June 1925—

Die Sage von König Athelstan (Kurt Beug), pp. 181-95.

Walter Scotts Kenntniss und Ansicht von deutscher Literatur (Fritz Sommerkamp), pp. 196-206.

HISTORY, Vol. X., April 1925—

The Allegory of Robinson Crusoe (George Parker), pp. 11-25.

Defoe's political autobiography.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXIV., April 1925—

Ælfric's Lives of St. Martin of Tours (Gordon Hall Gerould), pp. 206-10.

Bodmer and Young (C. H. Ibershoff), pp. 211-8.

A Possible Interpretation of *The Misfortunes of Arthur* (Evangelia H. Waller), pp. 219-45.

Equations with James VI., Mary Queen of Scots, and the younger Bothwell.

THE LIBRARY (TRANSACTIONS OF THE BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SOCIETY), Vol. V., March 1925—

The Lost Literature of Mediæval England (R. W. Chambers), pp. 293-321.

The First Illustration to 'Shakespeare' (E. K. Chambers), pp. 326-30.
Reproduction of a drawing accompanied by verses altered from *Titus Andronicus* and signed by Henry Peacham with a date apparently intended for 1595.

—Vol. VI., June—

The Spanish Tragedy—A Leading Case (W. W. Greg), pp. 47-56.

Discussion of the circumstances of the publication of the earlier editions.

Anthony Munday's Romances of Chivalry (Gerald R. Hayes), pp. 57-81.

THE MASK, Vol. XI., January 1925—

Reproduction of G. B. Nolli's Plan of Rome (*Nuova Topografia di Roma*), 1748.

—July—

Reproduction of the *Plan de Paris dessiné et gravé sous les ordres de Michel-Etienne Turgot*, 1734-9.

Large-scale maps useful to students of this period. It is proposed to continue the series with other rare plans, of London and of other Italian cities.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 501

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES, Vol. XL., April 1925—

Defining Romanticism: A Survey and a Program (Paul Kaufman),
pp. 193-204.

Two Notes on Ben Jonson's *Staple of News* (Frederick A. Pottle),
pp. 223-26.

Notes on I., 1, 3; III., 2, 54-57, 76-83, 106-8.

The Sources of *Othello* (Walter L. Bullock), pp. 226-28.
Against theory of Byzantine source.

Shelley's Indebtedness to Sir Thomas Lawrence (Walter Edwin
Peck), pp. 247-49.

Influence of *The Empire of the Nairs* on *Laon and Cythna*.

"And on the left hand Hell" (Edward Chauncey Baldwin), p. 251.

Note on *Paradise Lost*, X. 322.

Wordsworth's *Happy Warrior* and Herbert's *Constancy* (Theodore T.
Stenberg), pp. 252-53.

—May 1925—

Chaucer's Renunciation of Love in *Troilus* (Karl Young), pp. 270-76.
An Holy Medytacion—by Lydgate? (Carleton Brown), pp. 282-85.

Evidence against ascription.

Imogen and Neronis (R. S. Forsythe), pp. 313-14.

Parallel between *Cymbeline* and *Sir Clyomon and Sir Clamides*.

Notes on Robert Greene's Plays (W. P. Mustard), pp. 316-17.

The Source of a Fourteenth Century Lyric (Beatrice Daw Brown),
pp. 318-19.

No. 126 in *Religious Lyrics of the Fourteenth Century* (Carleton Brown).

—June 1925—

Chaucer and the Church (E. P. Kuhl), pp. 321-38.

On the Chronology of Thomas Kyd's Plays (T. W. Baldwin),
pp. 343-49.

Beowulf 159-163 (Albert Stanborough Cook), pp. 352-54.

Concerning James Mill (Ronald B. Levinson), pp. 379-80.

Authorship of review of Taylor's translation of Plato.

Shakespeare's "Small Latin" (Malcolm L. Wilder), pp. 380-81.

Parallel between Seneca, *Controversiae*, II. 5 and I. Henry IV., II. 3.

Bernardin de Saint-Pierre and Charlotte Brontë (Jno. N. Ware),
pp. 381-82.

MODERN LANGUAGE REVIEW, Vol. XX., April 1925—

Elizabeth Elstob, The Learned Saxonist (Margaret Ashdown),
pp. 125-46.

The first woman student of Anglo-Saxon.

The Old Drama and the New (Elmer Edgar Stoll), pp. 147-57.

Discussion of some of Mr. Archer's criticisms of the Elizabethans.

Fenimore Cooper's Influence on the French Romantics (Eric Partridge), pp. 174-78.

A Rare Use of the Preposition "To" (W. A. Craigie), pp. 184-85.

"Pythagoras concerning Wilde-Fowle" (Bruce Dickins), p. 186.

Actual source of *Twelfth Night*, IV., 2, 52-8.

The Sources of Giles Fletcher's *Licia* (Janet G. Scott), pp. 187-88.

Ann Radcliffe's Knowledge of German (L. F. Thompson), pp. 190-91.

MODERN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXII., May 1925—

Abbot Ælfric's Rhythmic Prose (Gordon Hall Gerould), pp. 353-66.

Influence of Latin rhymed prose.

Artorius (Kemp Malone), pp. 367-74.

Arthur and second-century L. Artorius Castus.

Richardson, Young, and the *Conjectures* (Alan D. McKillop), pp. 391-404.

"This figure that thou here seest put" (John D. Rea), pp. 417-19.

Ancestry of Jonson's lines.

NINETEENTH CENTURY AND AFTER, Vol. XCVII., April 1925—

The Decline of the Irish Drama (Andrew E. Malone), pp. 578-88.

—June 1925—

Sheila Kaye-Smith as a Poet (Coulson Kernahan), pp. 910-24.

A Literary Experiment: *The Spanish Farm* and *6494* (L. F. Easterbrook), pp. 925-30.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 148, May 16, 1925—

The Identification of Scan Omodu (Alfred Anscombe), pp. 352-53.

Discussion continued by W. J. Andrew, June 6th, pp. 410-11.

—June 6—

"Or Mons, the hill" (A. R. Bayley), pp. 399-401. Concluded

June 13th, pp. 417-19.

Suggested explanation of *Love's Labour's Lost*, V., 1, 77-83.

—June 20—

Thomas Middleton's early Non-Dramatic Work (H. Dugdale Sykes), pp. 435-38.

NOTES AND QUERIES, Vol. 148, June 27—

Scan Omodu in Arthurian Legend (Alfred Anscombe), pp. 453-54.

PHILOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, Vol. IV., No. 2, April 1925—

The Ethics of King Lear (Hardin Craig), pp. 97-109.

Grimmelshausen's *Simplicius Simplicissimus* and Defoe's *Robinson Crusoe* (Erwin Gustav Gudde), pp. 110-20.

The Adventures of Hamlet's Ghost (Thornton S. Graves), pp. 139-50.

On the Etymology of Hamlet (Kemp Malone), pp. 159-60.

The Reputation of the "Metaphysical Poets" during the Age of Pope (Arthur H. Nethercot), pp. 161-79.

SUMMARY OF PERIODICAL LITERATURE 503

PUBLICATIONS OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, Vol. XL., March 1925—

English Manuscripts in the Vatican Library (Grace Frank), pp. 98-102.

Peterloo, Shelley and Reform (A. Stanley Walker), pp. 128-64.

Shelley, Mary Shelley, and *Rinaldo Rinaldini* (Walter Edwin Peck),
pp. 165-71.

Possible influence of the novel on Shelley's early romances, *Laon and
Cythna*, *Prince Athanase*, and Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*.

Shelley's *Prometheus Unbound*, or Every Man his own Allegorist
(Newman I. White), pp. 172-84.

Shelley's Debt to Leigh Hunt and the *Examiner* (Walter Graham),
pp. 185-92.

Hunt's early reviews of Shelley.

Two Early Reviews of Keat's First Volume (Roberta D. Cornelius),
pp. 193-210.

Magazine, reprinted in full.

Thackeray's *Pendennis* as a Source of Foutane's *Frau Jenny Treibel*
(Lambert A. Shears), pp. 211-16.

REVUE ANGLO-AMERICAINE, April 1925—

Succession, Pamphlets et Théâtre sous Elisabeth : La "Doleman's
Conference," 1594 (G. Lambin), pp. 299-312.

Swinburne, poète grec et latin (Paul Dottin), pp. 328-30.

Une page de Mallarmé sur Hamlet et Fortinbras (A. Brulé),
pp. 330-32.

Reprinted from the *Revue Blanche*, July 15, 1896.

George Sigerson (Charles Garnier), pp. 332-34.

—June 1925—

Les Océanides et le thème de l'amour dans le *Prométhée* de Shelley
(A. Koszul), pp. 385-93.

Emily Dickinson ; Essai d'analyse psychologique (J. Catel), pp.
394-405.

Stephen Hudson (D. Saurat), pp. 406-18.

Swinburne et les Dieux (P. Dottin), pp. 419-27.

La Date de *Cymbeline* (P. Reyher), pp. 428-30.

Evidence for 1610.

Shakespeare, *Cymbeline*, 1. iv. 74 (J. Derocquigny), pp. 430-32.

Sur un passage du *David et Bethsabie* de G. Peele (A. Donnarel),
pp. 432-4.

STUDIES IN PHILOLOGY, Vol. XXII., April 1925 (Elizabethan Studies : Tenth series)—

Shakespeare's Unquestioned Autographs and the Addition to *Sir
Thomas More* (S. A. Tannenbaum), pp. 133-60.

With numerous facsimiles.

- Shakespearean and Other Feasts (O. F. Emerson), pp. 161-83.
 Women on the Pre-Restoration Stage (T. S. Graves), pp. 184-97.
 Imitations from Tasso in the *Faerie Queene* (H. S. Blanchard), pp. 198-21.
 Spencer and Alexander Neckam (F. F. Covington, Jr.), pp. 222-25.
 "F. S., Which is to say . . ." (R. Withington), pp. 226-33.
 Discussion of the mysterious initials marked on the gloves given by Humphrey to Luce in *Kt. of Burning Pestle*, Act. I.
 Drayton's Use of Welsh History (R. R. Cawley), pp. 234-55.
 Classical Lives in *The Mirror for Magistrates* (Douglas Bush), pp. 256-66.
 Notes on John Lyly's Plays (W. P. Mustard), pp. 267-71.
 Recent Literature of the English Renaissance (T. S. Graves), pp. 272-346.
 Bibliography of books issued during 1924 which deal with the Elizabethan period.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, April 2, 1925—

- The Authorship of *Anastatius* (J. Gennadius), p. 240.
 Reply by H. W. Law, April 9th, p. 253.

—April 9—

- An Allusion in *II. Henry IV.* (A. R. Cripps), p. 253.
 Note on I. 2.

—April 16—

- Jane Austen's *Sanditon* (John Sampson), p. 268.
 Suggested emendation; confirmed by reference to manuscript, R. W. Chapman, May 14th, p. 335.
 New Light on Thomas Shadwell (D. M. Walmsley), p. 268.
 Biographical material; note on it by the Rev. Montague Summers, May 7th, p. 316; rejoinder by D. M. Walmsley, May 14th, p. 335; reply by the Rev. Montague Summers, May 21st, p. 352.

—April 23—

- A Shakespeare Emendation (F. Madan), p. 284.
Julius Caesar, III. i. 175.
 Discussion continued by Henry Cuninghame and Penrhyn Chave, April 30th, p. 300; by A. C. R. Carter, May 14th, p. 335.
 The Royal Society's Shakespeare Second Folio (M. H. Spielmann), p. 284.
 Typographical note. Correction by F. S. Ferguson, April 30th, p. 300; and further note by M. H. Spielmann, May 7th, p. 316.
 Falstaff's Death (H. P. Dean), p. 284.
 Suggestion that 1623 folio readings are correct.

—April 30—

- Blake and Hayley (Max Plowman), p. 300.
 An Error in Dryden (D. M. Law), p. 300.
Theodore and Honoria, l. 58.

TIMES LITERARY SUPPLEMENT, May 7—

The Stratford Monument (R. Crompton Rhodes), p. 316.

Evidence of date of colouring.

—May 21—

The Death of Marlowe (Eugénie de Kalb), p. 351.

The Death of Marlowe (E. K. Chambers), p. 352; also (William Poel), p. 352.

Discussion continued by Sir George Greenwood and Oliver W. F. Lodge, June 4th, p. 384.

A Misprint in *Troilus* (Peter Haworth), p. 352.

Note on III. iii., 3 ff.

Discussion continued by W. W. Greg, May 28th, p. 368; Peter Haworth, June 4th, p. 384.

—May 28—

Chapman and Mary Stewart (A. S. Ferguson), p. 368.

Reference in *Sir Gyles Goosecappe*, *Knight*.

Blake and Wordsworth (Edith J. Morley), p. 368.

Correction of errata in volume of extracts from Crabb Robinson's remains.

—June 4—

The Gordian Knot Untied (Dennis Arundell), p. 384.

Identification with *Trelooby*.

Discussion continued by W. J. Lawrence and Felix White, June 11th, p. 400; Dennis Arundell, June 18th, p. 416.

—June 11—

An Epithalamium to Mr. F. H. (G. C. Moore Smith), p. 400.

Randolph's poem.

Greene and Dekker (G. V. Jones), p. 400.

Parallel passages in "coney-catching" pamphlets.

Discussion continued by R. B. McKerrow, June 18th, p. 416.

Reynolds, Hunt and Keats (Walter Edwin Peck), p. 400.

—June 25—

Milton's Spelling (Darrell Figgis), p. 432.

"Wen" (R. W. Chapman), p. 432.

Application of term to London before Cobbett by Jane Austen.

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1925

B.A. with Honours in English Language and Literature.

BELFAST.—English Literature :

Class II.—R. D. Ewing, H. T. Faherty.

Class III.—Ethel A. Moore.

BIRMINGHAM.—English :

Class I.—Dorothy M. Benton, Gladys G. M. Tranter.

Class II.—Florence M. Cadwallader, N. T. Carrington, Mary Furber, Marjorie F. Hilton, Mary A. Jones, H. P. Kingston, Nora F. Lambert, L. C. Pountney, I. A. Shapiro, W. R. Swale.

Class III.—M. N. Doe, Evelyn E. Leake, Hilda Randle, Lucy V. Stroud.

BRISTOL.—English :

Marjorie Wallis, Norah Watson, B. Finn, Marjorie L. Hourd, Mary Levy, Kathleen D. Vicary, Kathleen M. C. Broackes.

CAMBRIDGE.—English Tripos :

Class I.—F. L. Coggin (*A*) (Trin.), G. C. Diamond (*A*) (Queens'), A. Ecclestone (*A*) (Cath.), J. G. Moore (*A*) (Joh.).

Class II.—V. G. Bailey (*a*) (Cla.), A. F. Bendall (*a*) (Queens'), R. d'E. Burford (*a*) (Cai.), W. J. Deacon (*a*) (Trin.), J. V. Dewhurst (*a*) (Christ's), D. J. Donovan (*b*) (non-coll.), E. A. Evans (*a*) (Christ's), V. H. Frank (*a*) (Down.), H. C. A. Gaunt (*a*) (King's), E. C. Gilbert (*a*) (Pemb.), F. E. Halliday (*a*) (King's), T. W. M. Halliday (*a*) (Christ's), J. D. Hayward (*a*) (King's), A. C. Healing (*a*) (Down.), R. C. Hodgson (*a*) (Cai.), N. McL. Innes (*a*) (Trin. H.), C. C. C. Lewis (*a*) (Joh.), C. J. Lewis (*a*) (Joh.), T. F. Long (*a*) (Christ's), A. R. MacPhail (*a*) (Trin. H.), F. H. Marchbank (*a*) (Joh.), A. E. Meadows (*a*) (Queens'), A. D. Owen (*a*) (Down.), E. L. Russell (*a*) (Christ's), T. Spencer (*b*) (Trin.), H. H. Thomas (*a*) (Sid. Suss.), L. B. Towner (*a*) (Cath.), F. B. Turner (*a*) (Christ's), E. F. Upward (*a*) (Corp. Chr.), R. C. Wilkinson (*a*) (Pemb.).

Class III.—R. W. Abel (*a*) (Pet.), T. H. Advani (*a*) (non-coll.), H. C. Alexander (*a*) (Trin.), S. Balister (*a*) (non-coll.), W. E. Blackwood (*a*) (Queens'), W. Bolton (*a*) (Pet.), E. W. Bowes (*a*) (Trin.), F. M. Britton (*a*) (Queens'), E. E. Chappell (*a*) (Queens'), F. H. Collier (*a*) (Jes.), P. D. Fee Smith (*a*) (Queens'), T. R. O. Field (*a*) (Joh.), R. J. Fuller (*a*) (Cath.), A. Hadfield (*a*) (non-coll.), B. F. Hall (*a*) (Trin.), J. W. A. Hanford (*a*)

(Jes.), S. H. H. Johnson (*a*) (King's), G. S. King (*a*) (Queens'), W. Leigh (*a*) (Christ's), D. E. B. Lord (*a*) (Trin. H.), C. T. Middleton (*a*) (Trin.), A. D. J. Milne (*a*) (Emm.), R. P. L. Parkin (*a*) (Queens'), H. Payson (*a*) (Trin. H.), L. R. Phillips (*a*) (Cai.), V. B. V. Powell (*a*) (Cai.), A. C. Privett (*a*) (Selw.), L. C. Rowe (*a*) (Cla.), J. K. Taylor (*a*) (Emm.), C. N. Vokins (*a*) (Queens'), D. Wood (*a*) (Down.).
Ægrotat.—A. S. Ishaque (*a*) (Pemb.).

WOMEN.

Class I.—M. Diggle (*A*) (Girton), G. E. Williams (*A*) (Newn.).

Class II.—M. S. Barker (*a*) (Newn.), W. L. Bond (*a*) (Girton), M. W. Bowden (*a*) (Girton), H. D. Chapman (*a*) (Newn.), E. V. E. Clark (*a*) (Girton), R. W. Daniells (*b*) (Newn.), K. M. C. fforde (*a*) (Newn.), W. M. Francis (*a*) (Newn.), M. D. Johnston (*a*) (Newn.), D. Lattimer (*a*) (Newn.), F. E. K. Levick (*a*) (Girton), I. R. McMorran (*a*) (Girton), N. M. Neve (*a*) (Girton), W. Park (*a*) (Newn.), E. A. Ramsbottom (*a*) (Newn.), A. B. H. J. Rustomjee (*a*) (*b*) (Girton), M. A. Scott (*a*) (Newn.), M. Sykes (*b*) (Newn.), H. M. Taylor (*a*) (Newn.), E. H. Temple (*a*) (Newn.), H. T. W. Wale (*a*) (Newn.), M. Walton (*b*) (Newn.), A. A. P. Williams (*a*) (Newn.).

Class III.—E. M. M. Aves (*a*) (Newn.), P. M. Hovell (*a*) (Newn.), P. W. Paget (*a*) (Newn.), H. E. Rees (*b*) (Newn.), K. F. Selby (*a*) (Newn.).

a = passed in English Literature, Modern and Mediæval. *b* = in Early Literature and History. A capital letter denotes that the candidate is placed in the First Class for proficiency in that section.

DURHAM.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—J. Shivas.

Class II.—Monica Byrne, Marion Skillen, Gladys Wilkinson.

Class III.—Mercy Coghlin, Maude Darke, Jane Henderson, Mary Palmer, Elsie Robson.

LEEDS.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—P. L. Carver, C. W. Morris, G. Taylor.

Class II.—Winifred Auty, Edna Bartholomew, Dorothy M. Chadwick, N. L. Clay, Helen Goodall, Evangeline Haigh, C. V. Jones, Katherine M. Kilbride, Mabel E. Legg, Alice K. Lineham, Annie Ogden, Elsie A. Ogg, Adela Scatchard, R. C. Scott, Dora Stevenson, H. Swales, Edith M. Walton, G. Woledge.

Class III.—J. H. Mosey, W. Taylor, Annie I. Walker.

Ægrotat.—Dorothy M. Mackereth.

LIVERPOOL.—School of English Literature :

Part I.—Sylvia Applebaum, Theodora Barnsley, Kathleen Considine, Hélène Davies, Doris E. Gibbs, Winifred Gill, Elizabeth Henderson, Elsie B. Hunt, Vera T. Jones, Blanche Meyrick, Veronica M. Nichols, Nancy Nixon, Marian A. Poppleton, Elizabeth M. Quayle, Lilian M. Shaw, H. G. Taylor, Elsie Walker.

Part II—Class I.—Marian G. Gray, Marjorie Lindley, Jean B. Pollock, Kathleen M. Robertson, N. R. Tempest, Mary Whitley.

Class II.—Div. 1 : Edith M. Gardner, C. V. Hales, Evelyn D. Harrison, J. W. Linn, Marjorie Russell, G. A. Sambrook, Alice J. Wild. Div. 2 : Annie Campbell, Emily W. Christian, Lilian Corteen, Freda A. Davis, Jane McC. Donaldson, Florrie Gill, Estelle Hodgson, Rhona Mason, Emily C. Mathews.

LONDON (Internal). English :

Class I.—Sylvia R. S. Brice (King's C.), F. E. Budd (East Lond. C.), Winifred M. Cropper (King's C.), W. J. B. Crotch (George Smith Studentship) (King's C.), Ina D. Dean (U. C.), Dorothy G. Hitch (East Lond. C.), Dorothy M. Jupp (Ryl. Holl. C.), Beatrice Levene (King's C.), J. W. Roche (U. C.), Annie M. Saltmarsh (King's C.), Eva M. Simmonds (Ryl. Holl. C.), Paula L. F. Sprigg and Joan I. Sturges (Bedf. C.), J. Wall (King's C.).

Class II.—Madhaniah Lakshmi Ammal (Bedf. C.), E. A. C. Andrews (U. C.), Eileen A. Arthurton (Bedf. C.), A. B. Badger and Dorothy M. Barker (U. C.), Dorothy F. Barter (King's C.), Amy M. Bickley (Ryl. Holl. C.), Enid M. Bridger (U. C.), Olive C. Broadway (King's C.), Margaret J. Bryce (Bedf. C.), Lilian E. Charlesworth (Birkbeck C.), Annie D. Clayton (Westfield C.), A. H. Clough (King's C.), Edith S. Crowther-Smith (Ryl. Holl. C.), Maude E. Cunningham (King's C.), W. A. G. D. Davidson (U. C.), Marjorie L. Dence (U. C.), Annie A. Divine (Ryl. Holl. C.), May Duffy (Bedf. C.), Marjorie B. Dumble (Westfield C.), Marjorie Fanchiotti, Dorothy H. Farrar, and Barbara S. Fell (Bedf. C.), Audrey I. J. Fisher (Ryl. Holl. C.), Margaret W. Gale (Bedf. C.), Lilian F. Gurry (King's C.), Velda S. Hann (Bedf. C.), Ida H. Heumann (King's C.), Edna A. Howlings (East Lond. C.), Alice M. Hughes and Frances L. Hughes (U. C.), G. S. Humphreys (King's C.), Mabel Lee (East Lond. C.), Alice G. Llewellyn (U. C.), Kathleen G. Lyford and Effie M. McClelland (Bedf. C.), Sheelah T. McLean (Westfield C.), Marjorie J. Martyn (Bedf. C.), C. H. M. Mattravers (King's C.), Edith Miller (U. C.), Winifred M. S. Moss and Margaret I. Newton (King's C.), Amelia T. O'Brien (Birkbeck C.), Frances C. Olver (Bedf. C.), Patricia N. Parker and Elsie Payne (Ryl. Holl. C.), K. D. Quick (U. C.), H. C. Reese, Yvonne M. Reeves, and Aline Reid (U. C.), Florence M. Rogers (King's C.), Marjorie C. Roulston (U. C.), Gwendolen M. Smith (King's C.), Gwenyth E. Smith (Westfield C.), L. P. Smith (East Lond. C.), Gladys Thompson (U. C.), Elinor J. Thomson (Bedf. C.), Maud H. Tracy (Birkbeck C.), H. J. Wheeler (King's C.), Evelyn M. Wild and D. E. Williams (U. C.), Muriel G. Williams (King's C.).

Class III.—B. Barnett (King's C.), Violet C. Callow (U. C.), Marion E. Carter (Ryl. Holl. C.), G. A. Cheshire (U. C.), Madeline E. Church (Ryl. Holl. C.), Eileen E. Colyer (East Lond. C.), Irene A. J. Coucke (Bedf. C.), Vera G. L. Crampton (U. C.), Floyd Q. Edmunds (Bedf. C.), Margaret Finch (Ryl. Holl. C.), Nora K. Hadden (Bedf. C.), Florence M. Hartington (Ryl. Holl. C.), G. E. Haslam (East Lond. C.), D. Johnson (U. C.), Ina L. L. Judge (East Lond. C.), Mary E. Kershaw (East Lond.

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1925 509

C.), Margaret M. Lawson (East Lond. C.), Joyce R. Meacham (Westfield C.), Rose K. Mitchell (King's C.), Mary K. Smith (U. C.), L. A. W. Thurgood * (U. C. and King's C.), J. H. Walter (U. C.), Mary Wilkinson (U. C.), Gladys A. Wilson (U. C.), Constance M. Wood (East Lond. C.)

LONDON (External). Medieval and Modern Languages—English :

Class I.—Norah M. Balchin (U. C., Ex.).

Class II.—Edna C. Beacroft (U. C., Nott.), Margery Bishopp (Priv.), Nellie Bonsor (U. C., L'ster), Marjory A. Butcher (U. C., Read.), Mary J. Butler (Notre Dame, L'pool), Edith G. Clark, Freda M. Clarke and Anne Daly (Priv.), G. Dixon (U. C., Nott., and Priv.), Mary L. Dixon (U. C., Nott.), A. Ecclestone and W. H. Gardner (Priv.), Edith M. Goud (U. C., L'ster), Agnes M. Guest, B.A. (Priv.), Ruby E. E. Hinch (U. C., Read.), Florence M. Howarth (U. C., Nott.), Edith E. Jessett and W. H. Lock (Priv.), Ethel Longdon (U. C., Nott.), Gladys E. Lucas (U. C., South.), Agnes M. Money (U. C., South., and Priv.), Audrey R. Palmer (U. C., South.), Constance M. A. Pantling (Ladies' C., Cheltenham), Florence M. Power (Notre Dame, L'pool), R. I. Redfern (Priv.), Nina M. L. Rolls (U. C., Read.), J. Smart (Priv.), B. J. Sparks, B.A., B.Sc. (Priv.), F. J. D. Thompson (Priv.), Cecil A. Waterfield, B.A. (Ladies' C., Cheltenham), Beatrice M. Watson (U. C., South.), Constance E. Wills (U. C., L'ster), Muriel I. Wilson (U. C., Read.), J. Wroe, B.A. (Priv.).

Class III.—T. Alderson (Priv.), J. E. M. Ashworth, F. R. G. Bastick, Ethel C. Brown, Grace E. Burgoyne, B.A., and N. R. Campbell (Priv.), Nora I. Clifford (Priv.), Cecilia F. Cooke, B.A., M. Curry, H. Faulkner, and Helen A. Fisher (Priv.), J. Fisher (U. C., Nott.), R. M. Fleming, B.A., and L. C. Furley (Priv.), Gladys K. Gerrits (Notre Dame, L'pool), Marjorie H. Gibbs (King's C.), J. Glenwright (U. C., Nott.), F. Goodwin (Mid. Inst., B'ham, and Priv.), Joan M. Gubb (U. C., South.), A. S. Harrison (Priv.), H. T. Hawkins (U. C., Ex.), Jessie E. Hinchley (Mid. Inst., B'ham, and Priv.), F. C. Holland, S. Houghton, and A. H. Jacobs (Priv.), Emily L. Jope (Priv.), F. T. Leighton and F. C. Lewis (Priv.), O. Livesey (St. Mary's C., Ham'smith, and Priv.), Mary I. Macfie and W. A. Mephram, B.A. (Priv.), Freda E. Mulready (U. C., Ex.), Mona A. Nevitt (U. C., L'ster.), Edith B. Nottle (U. C., Ex.), Norah G. Oakley (Priv.), Helen M. E. Parry (U. C., Ex.), A. Penman (Priv.), A. J. Pennington (U. C., Nott.), G. S. Phalp (Midland Inst., B'ham., and Priv.), C. N. Pleasance (Priv.), H. Porter (Winchester Training C. and Priv.), Edith H. Proudman, Mabel Read, R. A. Riley and Margaret N. Ross (Priv.), Blanche I. Russell (U. C., Nott.), P. Scott, B.A. (Priv.), Teresa Sharkey (U. C., Read.), Hilda M. Smithard (U. C., Nott.), Alice Spencer (Priv.), R. Stewart (Priv.), Dorothy H. Street (U. C., Ex.), Edith H. Thomas (U. C., Nott.), Agnes A. Thompson (Priv.), Edith G. E. Walker (U. C., Read.), Angela M. Ward (Coll. of the Sacred Heart, Ham'smith), S. A. Warren (Priv.), D. C. Whitaker (Priv.), G. Whiteley (C. of St. Mark and St. John), Marjorie D. Wolfe (U. C., South., and Priv.).

* Required to pass in Latin at some Intermediate or Final Examination before receiving the Degree.

MANCHESTER.—English Language and Literature :

Class I.—J. P. Oakden, L. S. Pearson.*Class II.*—Div. 1 : Evelyn M. Campbell, Vera Gawthorpe, Mary Ireland, Doris E. Kindberg, J. C. Mallison, Helen A. Noar, L. H. Oldfield, Edward Ollerenshaw, Sarah O'Neill, Una M. Orme, Beatrice Webb. Div. 2 : Gwendoline Allard, Sybil Cooke, Marion Fildes, Ada Parker, Mabel Radcliffe.*Class III.*—Eva M. Foster, Dorothy M. Harrison, Mary E. Hollings, Evelyn Rhoden.

OXFORD.—English :

Class I.—E. G. D. Fawkes (Keble), H. A. Harris (Jesus), E. A. Seaborne (Magd.), A. Twyman (New Coll.), Ruth Crook (Som.), Christina Goudie (St. H. H.), Mary L. Lauterbach (St. H.), Edith M. Nielsen (St. H. H.), Margaret J. Sargeaunt (St. H.), Amy G. Stock (Som.), May D. Yardley (L. M. H.).*Class II.*—N. B. Allen (St. John's), A. J. Bull (Magd.), G. Caiger (St. John's), W. H. Coates (Queen's), H. E. Cooper (Keble), H. G. Griffin (St. John's), R. W. Hamilton (Worc.), L. Hardy (Keble), M. Hasan (St. John's), A. J. L. Heaver (New Coll.), D. Hopkins (Keble), A. H. Hyland (Magd.), F. E. Langermann (New Coll.), S. J. Liddell (B. N. C.), J. N. H. Marshall (Worc.), E. Mims (Oriol), W. M. Morfey (Magd.), R. R. Nattrass (St. Ed. H.), J. A. K. Nye (Mert.), O. W. Pendleton (Worc.), K. Preston (St. John's), A. J. Shaw-Kennedy (Ch. Ch.), A. H. Tandy (Magd.), J. A. Terry (Univ.), C. W. Thomas (Pemb.), R. M. Titlestad (Univ.), A. C. Valentine (Ball.), D. J. N. Wanstall (Keble), D. W. Wheeler (Keble), Mary V. Baker (H.-S.), Daisy Brown (H.-S.), Janet Carpenter (Som.), Esther Chawner (St. H.), Sylvia Clark (H.-S.), Evelyn Cryer (St. H.), Gertrude M. David (H.-Sd.), Ellen C. M. de Peyer (L. M. H.), Agnes B. V. Drew (St. H. H.), Elizabeth N. Fawcett (St. H.), Doris M. Fone (Som.), Joan Grosvenor (St. H.), Marjorie G. Harwood (St. H.), Margaret M. S. Helm (H.-S.), Joyce M. Horner (St. H. H.), Iris E. Hort (L. M. H.), Marjorie Jackson (Som.), Margaret M. Kendall (H.-S.), Catherine A. Lambert (Som.), Margaret G. Last (H.-S.), Doris B. Lickes (St. H. H.), Joan B. Love (L. M. H.), Agnes M. Macdonald (St. H. H.), Julia M. Mavrogordato (St. H. H.), Helen McLanahan (H.-S.), Alicia C. Percival (St. H.), Lucy Rabson (Som.), Laura E. Salt (H.-S.), Eleanor J. Sampson (St. H. H.), Annie Samson (H.-S.), Jean Sorsbie (L. M. H.), Janetta C. Stuart (H.-S.), Margaret S. Taylor (St. H. H.), Margaret Thomson (Som.), Nellie J. van der Merwe (St. H. H.), Hilda M. Weston (St. H.), Gwendoline P. Willson (Som.), Catherine R. Wilson (H.-S.), Vesta H. Wood (H.-S.).*Class III.*—B. G. Aston (Worc.), S. A. McD. Baird (Magd.), R. W. C. Baker-Beall (Worc.), F. G. Bennett (Worc.), F. W. Benton (St. Ed. H.), E. P. Brice (St. Ed. H.), K. H. Broadus (Mert.), G. V. Carlin (St. Ed. H.), W. M. Colby (Ch. Ch.), R. Collick (Pemb.), R. D. George (Linc.), G. J. K. Harrison (Trin.), A. McD. B. Hutt (Univ.), T. A. Little (Ch. Ch.), J. W. Loubser (Trin.), H. McAneny (Linc.),

UNIVERSITY EXAMINATION RESULTS, 1925 511

B. P. Mohan (St. Ed. H.), C. D. Murray (Non-Coll.), H. Nicholson (Keble), J. H. Pain (Wadh.), G. Peach (Ball.), A. B. Poole (Keble), R. Y. Sanders (Univ.), G. D. Smith (Exet.), the Hon. W. H. Smith (New Coll.), H. S. Stovold (Mert.), W. A. Telfer (Pemb.), J. R. Theobald (Non-Coll.), F. B. Wesley (St. Ed. H.), C. T. Wood (Linc.), Georgina L. Arrowsmith (St. H.), Agnes E. Barry (St. H.), Phyllis C. Bebro (L. M. H.), Mary H. E. Benson (St. H.), Gwendoline M. Bryant (H.-S.), Audrey M. Charlton (H.-S.), Dorothy L. Clarke (H.-S.), Frances Crossfield (St. H.), Gwendolen A. Farrell (St. H. H.), Louise B. Feely (L. M. H.), Edith Forrest (L. M. H.), Iris D. Free (St. H.), Florence E. Freeth (Som.), Beryl L. Frere (H.-S.), Joan K. Galbraith (St. H.), Vera G. P. Guyon (H.-S.), Winifred M. Hardisty (St. H. H.), Annie N. Hartley (St. H. H.), Margaret Hinchliff (H.-S.), Winifred I. Leonard (H.-S.), Ella N. Martin (St. H.), Mary Matthai (Som.), Irene C. Phillips (H.-S.), Sibyl M. Pimblett (St. H. H.), Maud E. F. Sumner (H.-S.), Edith M. Watson (St. H.), Agnes F. Young (H.-S.).

Class IV.—E. Diaconu (Non-Coll.), E. C. A. Firman (Keble), A. B. Hughes (Jesus), R. W. Nelson (Exet.), A. F. Sinclair (Univ.), G. S. V. R. Thackeray (St. Ed. H.), E. J. Urquhart (Keble), H. G. Weekes (Exet.), Katharine M. Allsop (St. H.), Margaret Ashford (St. H.), Ann Douglass (H.-S.), Mary C. J. Harvey (St. H.), Averil C. Mathews (H.-S.), Margaret B. O'Farrell (St. H.), Mabel A. Roberts (St. H.), Diana Ruxton (St. H. H.).

Egrotant.—Mary Somerville (Som.) and Mary W. Steel (St. H.).

Satisfied the examiners in Group B.6.—Cicely O. J. A. Awdry-Nicks (St. H.).

SHEFFIELD.—English :

Class I.—Lucie Drake, Margaret M. Horan.

Class II.—Division 1 : J. S. Moon, C. Pybus ; Division 2 : E. A. Loten.

WALES.—English :

Class I.—Margaret E. Griffiths (Aber.), T. R. Hughes (Bangor), Leslie V. Jenkins (Card.), Annie M. Jones (Aber.), B. F. Michael (Aber.), Betty T. Morgan (Card.), Gladys M. Thomas (Aber.), D. G. Williams (Aber.).

Class II.—*Div. 1* : S. H. Alberga (Aber.), Dilys M. Cledwyn (Aber.), Mary L. Dodd (Aber.), Gwenda M. Everall (Bangor), Phyllis Jenkins (Card.), W. E. Jenkins (Swan.), G. R. John (Aber.), Eva M. Maud (Aber.), Frances M. Morgan (Swan.), G. S. Morris (Swan.), Jane Smith (Card.), W. H. Tallis (Card.), Beatrice E. Wildman (Card.), Enid Williams (Swan.).
Div. 2 : Eileen David (Card.), Gwladys C. Davies (Card.), Hadyn Davies (Aber.), Margaret D. Evans (Bangor), Marion M. Eve (Bangor), Evelyn M. Griffiths (Card.), Gertrude Hall (Aber.), Doris B. Ireland (Swan.), Phyllis O. Pratt (Aber.), P. T. Rees (Card.), Kathleen M. E. Stevens (Card.), Rhianon Williams (Aber.).

Class III.—J. Adams (Swan.), Winifred E. Bowser (Swan.), J. L. Davies (Aber.), Evelyn M. Graham (Aber.), D. R. Jones (Aber.), Elizabeth D. Lloyd (Aber.), Mabel Morgan (Card.), Ivy Nicholls (Card.), A. Prosser (Card.).

M.A. with Honours.

ABERDEEN.—English :

Class I.—Dorothy M. Cruickshank, E. R. R. Linklater, Florence A. Strachan.

Class II.—E. G. Baird, Jane A. Caie, W. Christie, Anne C. Cruickshank, A. Kidd, R. M. Low, Jane H. L. McNaughton, A. A. Walker.

EDINBURGH.—English :

Class I.—A. Law, R. A. C. Oliver, A. B. Taylor, Mary B. Watts, M.A. (Lond.), Annabella M. White.

Class II.—Margaret B. Bayne, Jean S. B. Gaddie, Ethel M. Hall, Margaret L. Hunter, J. A. Jamieson, M. M'Pherson, Helen D. Oswald, Mary M'F. Reid, H. J. L. Robbie, Andrina T. Smith, May C. Williamson.

Class III.—Margaret W. Fyffe, Janet Hunter.

ERRATUM.

Page 92, last line, for Frith read Firth.

INDEX

- Actors, English, in Paris, 392 *sqq.* : *see* Players
- Adam, R. B., Reproduction of Boswell's Proof-sheets by, 121
- Agrippa, Cornelius, borrowings from, by John Davies, 243
- Akenside, M., his *Pleasures of Imagination*, 346
- Alban, St., *Illustrations to the Life of*, reviewed, 114
- Allen, Miss H. E., on the *Ancren Riwle*, 15 *sqq.*
- Ancient Rome in the English Novel*, by Randolph Faries, noticed, 123
- Ancren Riwle*, Research upon the, 4 *sqq.*
- Arcadia*, borrowing from, in *Eikon Basilike*, 385
- Archer, William, notice of, 221
- Arte of English Poesie, The Authorship of the*, article by B. M. Ward, 284
- Ayres, H. M., translations of early Dutch plays, 160 *sqq.*
- Bag-Pipes on the Stage (1607), 185
- Baildon, John, his writing-book, 198 *sqq.*
- Barnouw, A. J., on early Dutch plays, 160 *sqq.*
- Barrowes, Thomas, clothworker (1615), 182
- Bateson, F. W., note on Cibber's *Double Gallant*, 343
- Bath Poetess of the Eighteenth Century, A*, article by O. Doughty, 404
- Batho, Edith C., *Summary of Periodical Literature*, 124, 247, 377, 499
- Bavaria, An Epistle from the Elector of, to the French King*, authorship of, 92
- Beau Chesne, Jean de, his writing-book, 198
- Beeston, William, his rights in Elizabethan plays, 84 *sqq.*
- Believe as you List*, study of the MS. of, 423 *sqq.*
- Bell, C. F., his edition of Inigo Jones's *Designs*, reviewed, 231
- Beowulf*, The Finn Episode in, 228
- Bernard, St., quotations from, in the *Ancren Riwle*, 18
- Best, Charles (fl. 1602-11), account of, 454
- Bibliographical Aspects of Some Stuart Dramatic Manuscripts*, article by C. J. Sisson, 421
- Black Prince, The* : *see* Orrery
- Blackman, Mrs. E., review by, 228
- Boas, F. S., his *The Year's Works in English Studies*, Vol. IV, noticed, 245
- Bodley Head Quartos, The*, Nos. XI, XII, noticed, 376
- Bonduca*, MS. of, 422
- Boswell, James, Reproduction of some of the Original Proof-sheets of his "Life of Johnson," reviewed, 121
- Boyle, Roger : *see* Orrery
- Bradner, Leicester, on Stages and Stage Scenery in Court Drama before 1558, 447
- Braithwaite, R., possibly author of *Cornelianum Dolium*, 315
- Brooke, Henry, his *Gustavus Vasa*, 460
- Brown, an English actor in Paris and provider of bears and dogs, 402
- Brown, Prof. Carleton, his *Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century*, reviewed, 116
- Buckingham, George Villiers, Duke of, and Dryden, 81 ; and *Absalom and Achitophel*, 82
- Bullen, A. H., his *Elizabethans* reviewed, 118

- Byrne, Muriel St. Clare, article on Elizabethan Handwriting, 198
- Byron, *The Present Value of*, article by O. Elton, 24
- Canon of Randolph's Dramatic Works, The*, article by G. C. Moore Smith, 309
- Careles Shepherdess, The*, authorship of, 320
- Carew, Richard, reference to Puttenham in his *Excellency of the English Tongue*, 291
- Chambers, Sir E. K., "Elizabethan Stage Gleanings" by, 75, 182; article on "The Integrity of *The Tempest*" by, 129, cf. 449; on the date of Geoffrey of Monmouth's History, 431; his *Elizabethan Stage* reviewed 97; and theatrical plots, 258; and the staging of early plays at Court, 447; review by, 484
- Chambers, Prof. R. W., article on Recent Research upon the *Ancient Riddle*, 4; and *Sir Thomas More*, 40
- Chandler, Mary, a Bath poetess, account of, 404
- Chapman, George, inscription by, 350
- Chapman, R. W., on a Poem attributed to Prior, 93; on the first edition of *The Pleasures of Imagination*, 346; on Johnson and Z. Williams, 458; on Brooke's *Gustavas Vasa*, 460; reviews by, 122, 239, 372
- Child, H., 495
- Churchyard, T., sonnet ascribed to, by Collier, 73
- Cibber, Colley, his *Double Gallant*, 343 sqq.
- Clay, Stephen, poem attributed to, 92
- Collier Mystification, A, 452
- Collier, J. P., and Malone, 73; and T. Churchyard, 73; and theatrical plots, 257
- Comparison between the Two Stages, A*, authorship of, 96
- Composers, Early Tudor: see Flood, W. H. Grattan
- Cornelianum Dolium*, authorship of, 311
- Corona Civica*, a poem, 93
- Court Drama before 1558, Stages and Stage Scenery in*, 447
- Cowling, G. H., his *A Preface to Shakespeare* reviewed, 359
- Creech, Thomas (1683), 195
- Crossley, James, and the authorship of *Cornelianum Dolium*, 315
- Cunningham, P., and the Revels Books, 166
- Curtain, an episode at the, 186
- Daniel, S., his *Cleopatra* imitated by Dryden, 79
- D'Avenant, his theatrical company and rights in plays at the Restoration, 84 sqq.
- Davies, John, of Hereford, 242
- Davis, H. W. C., his edition of *Medieval England* (Barnard's Companion) reviewed, 111
- Dead Man's Fortune, The*, plot of, 263
- Dekker, T., his *Four Birds of Noah's Ark*, ed. F. P. Wilson, noticed, 375
- Devil's Coach-Horses, The*, article by J. R. R. Tolkien, 331
- Dottin, Paul, 96
- Double Gallant, The*, 343
- Doughty, Oswald, article on "A Bath Poetess" (Mary Chandler), 404
- Drama, American: see Quinn, Prof. A. H.; Early Eighteenth Century: see Nicoll, Prof. A.
- Drama: see "Court Drama"
- Dramatic MSS., C. J. Sisson on, 421 sqq.
- Draper, J. W., his *William Mason, a Study in Eighteenth Century Culture* reviewed, 497
- Dryden, Some Notes on*, by G. Thorn-Drury, 79, 187, 324; Dryden's Poem to King William, 192; his *All for Love* and Daniel's *Cleopatra*, 79; his *Medal*, 324; variant readings in Prologues and Epilogues by, 324; his *Absalom and Achitophel*, 326; his visit to Milton, 80, 348; Dryden and the Earl of Buckingham, 81 his pecuniary circumstances, 83; Dryden and the Earl of Orrery, 173; and Shadwell, 187; and

- Creech and Tonson, 195, and the opera on *The Tempest*, 327
- Durfey, Thomas, his *Sir Barnaby Whigg*, 188
- Dutch Library, The*, 159
- Dymes, Miss D. M. E., and the *Ancren Riwle*, 9
- Early Dutch Secular Drama*, article by A. W. Reed, 159
- Eighteenth Century, *The*: see Nicoll, A., Partridge, E., Draper, J. W., Haferkorn, R.
- Eikon Basilike*, 385
- Elizabethan Handwriting for Beginners*, article by M. St. C. Byrne, 198
- Elizabethan Stage, The*, review by W. W. Greg, 97; note upon Chapters XX and XXI of, by H. Granville-Barker, 60
- Elizabethan Stage Gleanings*, article by Sir E. K. Chambers, 75, 182
- Elizabethans*, by A. H. Bullen, reviewed, 118
- Elton, Prof. Oliver, article on *The Present Value of Byron*, 24
- England in the Nineteenth Century*, Vol. I, noticed, 246
- English Actors in Paris during the Lifetime of Shakespeare*, article by Frances A. Yates, 392
- Englishmen for my Money*, 216
- English Poesie, the Arte of*: see *Arte English Romayne Lyfe, The*, by A. Munday, 376
- Esmoreit*, a Dutch play, 159 sqq.
- Evidence of Theatrical Plots for the History of the Elizabethan Stage, The*, article by W. W. Greg, 257
- Fable of the Bees, The*, 366
- Faithful Friends, The*, Fletcher's, MS. of, 423 sqq.
- Faries, Randolph, his *Ancient Rome in the English Novel* noticed, 123
- Fincham, F. W. X., 77, 182
- Finn Episode in Beowulf*, by R. A. Williams, 228
- Firth, Sir Charles H., on "Two Poems attributed to Prior," 456
- Flatman, Tho., song for St. Cecilia's Day by, 220
- Fleay, F. G., and *The Tempest*, 143
- Fletcher, John, MSS. of his *Honest Man's Fortune* and *Faithful Friends*, 423 sqq.
- Flood, W. H. Grattan, on Orrery's *Black Prince*, 341; on a Patent for Paris Garden in 1547, 461; his *Early Tudor Composers* reviewed, 498
- Ford, John, an Inedited MS. of his *Fames Memoriall*, 93; spelling of his name, 95; an unprinted poem by, 217
- Fort, J. A., his *Two Dated Sonnets of Shakespeare* reviewed, 353
- Fortunes Tennis*, plot of, 269
- Foure Birds of Noah's Arke*, by T. Dekker, 375
- Frederick and Basilea*, plot of, 269
- Frith, Mary, the "Roaring Girl," 77
- Galli, Antimo, letter of (1611-15), 186
- Gargano, G. S., 185
- Garrod, Prof., and Wordsworth's *Prelude*, 152 sqq.
- Garth, Richard (1553), 280
- Gawain, Sir, and the Green Knight*, ed. J. R. R. Tolkien and E. V. Gordon, 484
- Geoffrey of Monmouth's History, The Date of*, article by Sir E. K. Chambers, 431
- Geyl, P., on early Dutch plays, 160
- "Ghost-parts" in early plays, 427
- Gildon, Charles, 96
- Gill, Alex., an elegy by (?), 218
- Gilson, J. P., review by, 115
- Globe Theatre, Site of the, 102-3, 184
- Goffe, Thomas, and *The Careles Shepherdess*, 323
- Goldsmith, Oliver, French sources of, 235
- Gollancz, Sir I., *Studies in the First Folio*, edited by, 492
- Gordon, E. V., his edition of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* reviewed, 484
- Gotik und Ruine*, von R. Haferkorn, 123

- Granville-Barker, H., A note upon Chapters XX and XXI of *The Elizabethan Stage* by, 60; review by, 231
- Grattan, J. H. G., review by, 484
- Gray, H. D., and *The Tempest*, 132
- Greg, W. W., article on Theatrical Plots, 257; note on "A Collier Mystification," 452; in *Studies in the First Folio*, 492; on Randolph's (?) *Praeludium*, 320; and *Sir Thomas More*, 40; and *The Tempest*, 137; reviews by, 97, 463
- Grenberye, John, and N. Udall, 279
- Gustavus Vasa, H. Brooke's, 460
- Haferkorn, Reinhard, his *Gotik und Ruine in der englischen Dichtung des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* noticed, 123
- Haines, C. M., note on "The Law of Re-entry" in Shakespeare, 449
- Hali Meidenhad, notes on, 212
- Hall, Dr. J., on the *Ancren Riwele*, 11, 22
- Hall, Officers of the (1625), 184
- Hams, T., tailor (1650), 386
- Handwriting, Elizabethan, 198 sqq.
- Harrison, G. B., on the date of *Sir Thomas More*, 337; rejoinder to, 441; his editions of *Pierce Penilesse* and *The English Romayne Life* noticed, 376
- Haughton, W., possible prototype of his *Englishmen for my Money*, 216
- Havens, Prof. Raymond D., on Dryden's visit to Milton, 348
- Haward, Sir W., his MS. book, 325
- Heawood, E., and watermarks in the "Revels Books," 167
- Heidrich, Hans, his *John Davies of Hereford, und sein Bild von Shakespeares Umgebung* reviewed, 242
- Hemminge, W. (1631), 311
- Heroic Play, English, originator of, 173
- Heywood, Thomas, scene in *Sir Thomas More* attributed to, 57
- Hills, Henry, printer, and Milton, 385 sqq.
- Hoby, Sir E., letter from (1595), 75-6
- Honest Man's Fortune*, Fletcher's MS. of, 422
- Honyngs, W., clerk of the Privy Council (1636), 169
- Hubbard, George, and the Site of the Globe Theatre, 103, 184
- Hughes, C., and the authorship of *The Arte of English Poesie*, 284 sqq.
- Integrity of the Tempest*, *The*, article by Sir E. K. Chambers, 129
- Jacob, E. F., his edition of illustrations to life of St. Alban, 114; review by, 111
- James, M. R., and Dublin MS. E. i. 40, 115
- Jespersen, O., his *Philosophy of Grammar* reviewed, 223
- Jhon, a theatrical scribe of the early seventeenth century, 422
- Johnson, Samuel, and the Longitude, 458; *Mrs. Piozzi's Anecdotes of*, ed. S. C. Roberts, reviewed, 372; see Boswell, J.
- Jones, Edward, letter quoted (1596-7), 76-7
- Jones, Inigo, his *Designs for Masques and Plays at Court*, ed. P. Simpson and C. F. Bell, reviewed, 231
- Jordan, Thomas, his "Money is an Asse," 1668..219
- Kaye, F. B., his ed. of Mandeville's *Fable of the Bees* reviewed, 366
- Kellner, Prof. Leon, his *Restoring Shakespeare* reviewed, 463
- Ker, W. P., Memorial to, 221
- Killigrew, his theatrical company and rights in plays, 84 sqq.
- Lancelot of Denmark*, a Dutch play, 159 sqq.
- La Fountayne, Erasmus de (c. 1630), 217
- la Primaudaye, his *French Academy* followed by John Davies, 244
- Lawrence, W. J., on *Englishmen for my Money*, 216; on the phrase "Grass and hay," 323; and the opera on *The Tempest*, 327

- Lee, Sir Sidney, his *The Year's Work in English Studies*, Vol. IV, noticed, 245; in *Studies in the First Folio*, 492
 Liljegren, his *Studies in Milton*, 385
 Litteris noticed, 244
 Lloyd, Bertram, on an inedited MS. of Ford's *Fames Memoriall*, 93; on an unprinted poem by Ford (?), 217
 Lotti, O., letter of (1607), 185
 Loveden, John, letter from (1603), 400
 Lowe, W. R. L., his edition of illustrations to life of St. Alban, 114
 Lowin, John, a player, 184
 Lumley, John Lord, possible author of *The Arte of English Poesie*, 300
 Lund, *Yearbook of the New Society of Letters* at, noticed, 244
 Luttrell, Narcissus, dates and notes in his books, 187, 190
Lycidas, lines 130, 131, interpretation of, 339
 Macaulay, G. C., on the *Ancren Riwle*, 4
Mac-Flechnoe, the date of, 187
 McKerrow, R. B., reviews by, 118, 242, 361, 492, 495
 McNabb, Father Vincent, and the *Ancren Riwle*, 14
 "Malone Scrap, The," 72
 Mandeville, Bernard, his *Fable of the Bees*, 366
 Marcham, F., his *The King's Office of the Revels* reviewed, 479
 Marston, J., play on a theme used by, 75
Mary of Nimmegen, a Dutch play, 159 sqq.
 Mason, William, by J. W. Draper, reviewed, 497
 Massinger, P., study of the MSS. of his *Beleue as you List* and *Parliament of Love*, 422, 423 sqq.
Massinissa and Sophonisba, *A Play of*, 75
 Mawer, Prof. Allen, review by, 223
Medal of John Bayes, The, authorship of, 190
Mediæval England (Barnard's "Companion to English History"), ed. H. W. C. Davis, reviewed, 111
Merry Devil of Edmonton, The, 323
Midsummer Night's Dream, A ("The New Shakespeare"), reviewed, 495
Milton and the King's Prayer, article by J. S. Smart, 385
 Milton, J., Dryden's visit to him, 80, 348
Monitor, The, 81
More, Sir Thomas, Shakespeare and, 40; position of, in the development of the drama, 49; date of, 53, 337, 441; authorship of the insurrection scene, 55; history of theatrical companies and, 268; bibliographical evidence derived from MS. of, 421
 Morley, Prof. Edith J., reviews by, 366, 497
 Munday, Antony, his *English Romaine Life*, ed. G. B. Harrison, noticed, 376
 Murrey, Mr., of the bed-chamber, 218
 Musgrave, Sir W., writer of the "Malone Scrap," 73; and the "Revels Books," 166
 Nashe, T., his *Pierce Penilesse*, ed. G. B. Harrison, noticed, 376
 Nicoll, Prof. Allardyce, article on "The Rights of Beeston and D'Avenant in Elizabethan Plays," 84; criticised by H. Spencer, 443; rejoinder, 446; his *A History of the Early Eighteenth-Century Drama* reviewed, 364; in *Studies in the First Folio*, 492; review by, 374
 Noel, Mary (c. 1630), 217
 Noel, Penelope, elegy on, 218
Note upon Chapters XX and XXI of the Elizabethan Stage, A, article by H. Granville-Barker, 60
Notes in Correction of the Text of Wordsworth's "Prelude", article by E. de Selincourt, 151
 Oldham, John (1678), 188
 Oldys, William, notes on Dryden, 192, 196
 Orrery, the Earl of, and the English Heroic Play, 173; his *Black Prince*, date of, 174, 341
 Osgood, Prof. C. G., on *Lycidas*, 339

- Paris, English Actors in, 392
 Paris Garden, Patent for, in 1547.. 461
Parliament of Love, The, MS. of, 422
 Parry, Sir Thomas, ambassador in Paris (1603), 399; letters from, 402
 Partridge, Eric, his *Eighteenth-Century English Romantic Poetry* reviewed, 370
 Pate, Ed., anagram by (c. 1630), 218
 Payne, F. W., article on *The Question of Precedence between Dryden and the Earl of Orrery with regard to the English Heroic Play*, by, 173; on Orrery's *Black Prince*, 342
 Peacock, T. L., *The Halliford Edition* of his Works reviewed, 239
 Peele, G., plot of his *Battle of Alcazar*, 258, 271; MS. claimed to be in his autograph, 452
Periodical Literature, Summary of, by Edith C. Batho, 124, 247, 377, 499
Philosophy of Grammar, The, by O. Jespersen, reviewed, 223
Pierce Penilesse, by T. Nashe, 376
 Piozzi, Mrs., her *Anecdotes of Johnson*, ed. S. C. Roberts, reviewed, 372
 Players: Elizabethan Companies of, 259; The Admiral's Company, 259; The Chamberlain's Company, 263; Lord Derby's Company, 266; Lady Elizabeth's Company, 182, list of, in 1615..183; The King's Players, 184; Lord Strange's Company of Players, 259
Pleasures of Imagination, The, The first edition of, 346
 Plots, Theatrical, 257
Poetical Reflections on Absalom and Achitophel, authorship of, 82
 Pollard, Prof. A. W., and *Sir Thomas More*, 40; on Verse Tests and Sir Thomas More, 441; review by, 359
 Pons, Emile, his *Swift, les Années de Jeunesse* reviewed, 487
 Pope, Alexander, and Mary Chandler, 412
Praeludium, by Randolph (?), 319
Prelude, The: see Wordsworth
 Prior, Mat., poems attributed to, 92, 456
 "Puttenham," supposed author of *The Arte of English Poesie*, 284
 Puttenham, George, 286, 289
 Puttenham, Richard, 286 sqq.
Question of Precedence between Dryden and the Earl of Orrery with regard to the English Heroic Play, article by F. W. Payne, 173
 Quiller-Couch, Sir A., 495
 Quinn, Prof. A. H., his *American Drama from the Beginning to the Civil War* reviewed, 374
 Radcliffe, Alex. (1638), and T. Randolph, 312
 Randolph, Thomas, article on the Canon of his Dramatic Works, 309
Recent Research upon the Ancen Riwle, article by R. W. Chambers, 4
 Reed, A. W., article on Early Dutch Secular Drama, 159; article on N. Udall and T. Wilson, 275; reviews by, 366, 370
Re-entry, The Law of, in *Shakespeare*, 449
Religious Lyrics of the XIVth Century, ed. Carleton Brown, reviewed, 116
Restoration Play Lists, The, 443
Restoring Shakespeare, by L. Kellner, reviewed, 463
Revels, The King's Office of the, 1610-1622, by F. Marcham, reviewed, 479
Revels Books, The: The Writer of the "Malone Scrap," by D. T. B. Wood, 72; *The Suspected Revels Books*, by D. T. B. Wood, 166
Review of English Studies, The, 1
 Reynolds, Edward (1596), 77
 Rhodes, R. Crompton, in *Studies in the First Folio*, 492
Richard II, the date of, 75
Rights of Beeston and D'Avenant in Elizabethan Plays, The, article by A. Nicoll, 84
Roaring Girl, The, 77-8
 Roberts, S. C., his edition of Mrs. Piozzi's *Anecdotes*, reviewed, 372

- Robertson, J. M., and *The Tempest*, 143
Roister Doister, date of, 281
Rooke, Sir George, a Poem to (1702), 93
Rossiter, Philip, 182
- Sadler, Ralph (fl. 1600), 350
Saint Sauveur, "secretary" to English Embassy at Paris (1603), 399, 401
Schücking, Prof. Levin L., on Shakespeare and *Sir Thomas More*, 40
"Sehais, Jehan," an English Actor, 393
Selincourt, E. de, Notes in Correction of the Text of Wordsworth's *Prelude*, by, 151
Sells, A. L., his *Les Sources françaises de O. Goldsmith* reviewed, 235
Seven Deadly Sins, *The*, plot of, 261 sqq.
Shaa, or Shaw, John, actor, 393
Shadwell, Thomas, and Dryden, 187, 190; and an Opera on *The Tempest*, 327; two songs ascribed to him, 350
Shakespeare and "*Sir Thomas More*," article by L. L. Schücking, 40
Shakespeare, *The* "Law of Re-Entry" in, 449; his versification and *Sir Thomas More*, 337, 441; *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, ed. Quiller-Couch and J. D. Wilson, reviewed, 495; article on the Integrity of *The Tempest*, 129; the date of *Richard II*, 75; *The Two Dated Sonnets of*, by J. A. Fort, reviewed 353; *The Sonnets*, ed. T. G. Tucker, reviewed, 353; *A Preface to Shakespeare*, by G. H. Cowling, reviewed, 359
Shakespeare's Hand in the Play of Sir Thomas More, 40 sqq.
"Shē," the etymology of, 437
Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama, by H. Dugdale Sykes, reviewed, 361
Sidgwick, F., review by, 116
Simpson, Percy, his edition of Inigo Jones's *Designs* reviewed, 231
Sir Barnaby Rudge, 189
Sisson, C. J., on some Stuart Dramatic Manuscripts, 421
Sleight, A. H., review by, 235
Smart, John S., article on "Milton and the King's Prayer" by, 385; notice of, 391
Smith, A. H., on some place-names and the etymology of "Shē," 437
Smith, Prof. G. C. Moore, article on the Canon of Thomas Randolph's Dramatic Work, 309; on Charles Best, 454
Smith, Nowell, and Wordsworth's *Prelude*, 151
Smith, Sir T., letter from (1565), 75
Some Contributions to Middle-English Lexicography, article by J. R. R. Tolkien, 210
Some Place-names and the Etymology of "Shē," article by A. H. Smith, 437
Spencer, Prof. Hazelton, on Restoration Play Lists, 443
Spielmann, M. H., in *Studies in the First Folio*, 492
Stages and Stage Scenery in Court Drama before 1558, note by L. Bradner, 447
Stevenson, Matthew, date of death, 95
Studies in the First Folio, intro. by Sir I. Gollancz, reviewed, 492
Summary of Periodical Literature, by E. C. Batho, 124, 247, 377, 499
Swallowe, John (1553), 281
Swift, Jonathan, *les Années de Jeunesse et le "Conte du Tonneau,"* by E. Pons, reviewed, 487
Sykes, H. Dugdale, his *Sidelights on Elizabethan Drama* reviewed, 361
- Tamar Cam*, plot of, 269
T.-D., G., on Matthew Stevenson, 95; on *A Comparison between the Two Stages*, 96; on *Jordan's Money is an Asse*, 219; on St. Cecilia's Day, 1686, 220; on an inscription by G. Chapman, 350; Whitehall in 1642.. 462
Tempest, The Integrity of The, article by Sir E. K. Chambers, 129
Tempest, the opera on *The*, 327
Text of early plays: false verse-lining, 423; repeated passages, 426; ghost parts, 427; variant speech-headings, 429
Thompson, Sir E. Maunde, and *Sir Thomas More*, 40

- Thorn-Drury, G., *Some Notes on Dryden* by, 79, 187, 324
Three Sisters of Mantua, a play, 216
 Tolkien, J. R. R., on Middle-English Lexicography, 210; on *The Devil's Coach-Horses*, 331; his edition of *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight* reviewed, 484
 Tonson, Jacob, letter of, 196
 Tooke, Charles, a poem attributed to (1702), 93
Troilus and Cressida, Chettle and Dekker's, 269
 Tucker, Prof. T. G., his edition of Shakespeare's Sonnets, reviewed, 353
Two Dated Sonnets of Shakespeare, *The*, by J. A. Fort, reviewed, 353
- Udall, Nicholas, and Thomas Wilson, article by A. W. Reed, 275
University Examination Results, 1925.. 506
- Vernon, Mr., a poem attributed to (1706), 93
- Waller, Edmund, a poem falsely attributed to, 196
 Walmsley, D. M., on two songs ascribed to Shadwell, 350
 Warcup, L., letter from, referring to Dryden's *Medal*, 324
 Ward, B. M., article on the authorship of the *Arte of English Poesie*, 284
 Ward, H. L. D., on the date of Geoffrey of Monmouth, 431
- Welles, Humphrey (1553), 280
 Whitehall in 1642.. 462
 Williams, Harold, review by, 487
 Williams, Prof. R. A., his *Finn Episode in Beowulf* reviewed, 228
 Williams, Zachariah, and Samuel Johnson, 458
 Wilson, F. P., his edition of Dekker's *Four Birds* reviewed, 375
 Wilson, Prof. J. Dover, and Sir Thomas More, 40; and *The Tempest*, 130; edition of *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, 495; in *Studies in the First Folio*, 492; review by, 359
 Wilson, Thomas, and N. Udall, 275
 Wood, D. T. B., article on *The Writer of the "Malone Scrap"*, 72; article on the Revels Books, 166
- Words and phrases discussed:
 "burde," 210; "eaueres," 331;
 "grass and hay!" 323; "greni," 214; "heasci," 213; "heme and hine," 215; "long home," 210;
 "medi," 214; "mirð," 213; "numnen," 213; "She," etymology of, 437; "suti," 214; "uleð," 214;
 "wori," 212
- Wordsworth, Notes in Correction of the Text of his *Prelude*, by E. de Selincourt, 151
- Yates, Frances A., article on English Actors in Paris during the Lifetime of Shakespeare, 392
Year's Work in English Studies, *The*, Vol. IV, noticed, 245

isode

ohn-

ker's

omas

130 ;

ght's

First

5

'riter

rticle

ssed :

331 ;

eni,"

and

210 ;

num-

y of,

214 ;

on of

E. de

glish

etime

The,

211